

KODIAK/ALEUTIANS
FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL
ADVISORY COUNCIL

Taken at:
Council Chambers
Sand Point, Alaska

September 20, 2001

ATTENDANCE

Council Members Present:

Della Trumble, Chair
Alfred B. Cratty, Jr.
Vincent M. Tutiakoff
Pete M. Squartsoff
Paul Gunderson
Speridon Simeonoff, Sr.
Ivan D. Lukin
John A. Foster
Richard Zacharof

Coordinator:

Michelle Chivers

Others Present:

Tim Jennings, US FWS, Office of Subsistence
Management; Carl Jack, BIA/US FWS; Pat
Petrivelli, US FWS; Steve Guertin, US FWS;
Sverre Pedersen, ADF&G; Richard Uberuaga, US
FWS, Anchorage Subsistence; Stephen Fried,
US FWS/OSM Anchorage; Jim Larson, US FWS;
Mike Thompson, BIA; Mike Edwards, US FWS;
Dan LaPlant, US FWS; Dan Conolly; Dick
Jacobsen, Mayor, Aleutians East Borough;
Dave Fisher, US FWS; Robert Stovall, Kodiak
NWR.

1 MS. TRUMBLE: Okay. It's about
 2 9:15. I think I'll call the meeting to
 3 order.
 4 Gilda isn't here; so, Michelle,
 5 do you want to do roll call?

6 MS. CHIVERS: Okay. Al Cratty?

7 MR. CRATTY: Here.

8 MS. CHIVERS: Vince Tutiakoff?

9 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Here.

10 MS. CHIVERS: Pete Squartsoff?

11 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Here.

12 MS. CHIVERS: Paul Gunderson?

13 MR. GUNDERSON: Here.

14 MS. CHIVERS: Speridon Simeonoff?

15 MR. SIMEONOFF: Here.

16 MS. CHIVERS: Della Trumble?

17 MS. TRUMBLE: Here.

18 MS. CHIVERS: John Foster?

19 Ivan Lukin?

20 MR. LUKIN: Here.

21 MS. CHIVERS: Richard Zacharof?

22 Okay. We have a quorum.

23 MS. TRUMBLE: I'd like to welcome
 24 everyone to our meeting here in Sand Point
 25 and maybe we can go around the room and let
 everybody know what your names are and what
 office you represent.

26 MR. JENNINGS: Good morning. My
 27 name is Tim Jennings, and I'm with the
 28 office of subsistence management in
 29 Anchorage; and I'm a division chief there.

30 MR. FRIED: My name is Steve
 31 Fried with the office of subsistence
 32 management in Anchorage. I'm with the

1 Fisheries Information Services.

2

3 MR. JACOBSEN: Dick Jacobsen.
4 I'm mayor of the East Aleutians Borough and
a fisherman.

5 MR. CONNOLLY: I'm Dan Connolly,
6 Alaska Department of Fish & Game here in
Sand Point.

7 MS. TRUMBLE: Sandi?

8 MS. MIEROP: I'm Sandi Mierop,
9 court reporter.

10 MS. CHIVERS: Michelle Chivers,
coordinator.

11 MR. UBERUAGA: Richard Uberuaga.

12 MR. FISHER: Dave Fisher,
13 wildlife biologist, Office of Subsistence
Management in Anchorage.

14 MS. PETRIVELLI: Pat Petrivelli,
15 anthropologist, Office of Subsistence
Management, Anchorage.

16 MR. EDWARDS: Mike Edwards, King
17 Salmon Fisheries office.

18 MR. LARSON: Jim Larson, project
manager of the King Salmon Fisheries office.

19 MR. LAPLANT: Dan LaPlant. I'm
20 with the office of fisheries management, and
I'm the liaison to the board of game.

21 MR. STOVALL: Robert Stovall,
22 Kodiak.

23 MR. JACK: Carl Jack, Native
liaison, OSM.

24 MR. LUKIN: My name is Ivan
25 Lukin, alternate from Port Lions.

MR. SIMEONOFF: Speridon

1 Simeonoff, Native Village of Akhiok.

2 MR. GUNDERSON: Paul Gunderson,
3 Nelson Lagoon.

4 MS. TRUMBLE: Della Trumble, King
5 Cove.

6 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Pete Squartsoff,
7 Port Lions.

8 MR. CRATTY: Al Cratty, Old
9 Harbor.

10 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Vince Tutiakoff,
11 Adak, Unalaska, Aleutians.

12 MS. TRUMBLE: We move on to move
13 an adoption of agenda.

14 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Madam Chair, I'd
15 like to add on to the additions of other new
16 business, rural/nonrural determination
17 update, where that process is, the last
18 meeting -- what was it, in Old Harbor, we
19 had a State rural determination process to
20 be determined by this meeting that we should
21 get some kind of direction as to existing
22 methodology and recommendations for
23 rural/nonrural determination. I'd like an
24 update where that's at.

25 MS. TRUMBLE: Okay.

MR. SQUARTSOFF: Madam Chair, I'd
like to add a discussion also on the
addition of other new business, discussion
on traditional use permit for Federal lands
for Alaska Natives.

MS. TRUMBLE: For Natives or
Alaskans?

MR. SQUARTSOFF: I would guess
probably under tribal council, tribal
members.

MS. TRUMBLE: Anything else?

MR. TUTIAKOFF: Move to adopt as

1 amended.

2 MS. TRUMBLE: Can we get an
update, too, from the biologists on what the
3 status is or who was hired on, because we
had a shared one at one point of time
4 supposedly between Bristol Bay and
Kodiak/Aleutians? We can have that in the
5 same section.

Any additions?

6 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Move to adopt.

7 MS. TRUMBLE: Motion by Vince
8 Tutiakoff to adopt motion of the agenda.
Do I hear a second?

9 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Second.

10 MR. GUNDERSON: Second.

11 MS. TRUMBLE: Seconded by Paul
12 and Pete.
Discussion?

13 All in favor signify by saying
"aye."

14 COUNCIL MEMBERS: Aye.

15 MS. TRUMBLE: Oppose, signify by
16 same.
Motion carries.

17 Next item on the agenda is review
and adoption of minutes of March 7th and
18 8th, 2001 meeting at Old Harbor.

19 MR. CRATTY: I move to adopt the
minutes.

20 MS. TRUMBLE: Motion by Al Cratty
21 to adopt the minutes.

22 MR. SIMEONOFF: Second.

23 MS. TRUMBLE: Seconded by
Speridon Simeonoff.

24 Question?
Discussion?

25 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Question.

1

MS. TRUMBLE: All in favor,
signify by saying "aye."

3

COUNCIL MEMBERS: Aye.

4

MS. TRUMBLE: Opposed, signify by
same.

5

Motion carries.

6

The next item on the agenda is
Chair's report, chair's meeting, May 2001;
and also this is regional council chair and
Federal Board meeting, May 10th, 2001.

7

8

I think at the chair's meeting,
to be honest with you, I didn't bring my
paperwork and I've been going through so
many -- between that and the C and T, I'm
trying to remember what we did. I know that
we took up all the proposals that we had at
the Federal board meeting, and the only one
was that deer and we had to go back and do
the public meeting in Kodiak on that.

12

The bear -- I think, we allotted
one subsistence bear per community in the
Aleutians East; and that did pass also.

13

14

I think at the chair's meeting,
the only thing that I can really recall that
we pretty much discussed was the split
between Bristol Bay, Kodiak/Aleutians; and
we were in agreement at the time to not have
a shared biologist. There was no concerns
or problems with that at either levels, so
that did go through.

17

18

Other than that, I can't recall
anything major. I don't know if I'm missing
something here.

19

20

MR. JENNINGS: Madam Chair, under
Tab D is the board response letter regarding
board action on the wildlife proposals.

21

That was the other major action.

22

MS. TRUMBLE: Tab D is a letter;
and then Tab D is annual report of fish &
wildlife, the response from there. So, if
there's any questions or discussion at this
time in regard to any of those items.

24

25

MR. TUTIAKOFF: Are we going to
review that? Is that on the agenda?

1 MS. TRUMBLE: We could just move
to Tab D, I guess.

2 Let's take it apart this time.
If you can look at the first one, which is

3 Tab D, that is the letter from Mitch
Demientieff, if there's any questions or

4 comments on that letter.

5 MR. SQUARTSOFF: There's going to
be something here on that --

6

7 MS. TRUMBLE: We'll have it on
teleconference.

8 MS. CHIVERS: This afternoon.

9 MS. TRUMBLE: On Tab D, move to
Tab E, and this is basically our annual

10 letter of report from the annual report to
Mitch, and then also enclosed is a response.

11 One of the big issues in regard
to a lot of this letter -- and we will have

12 a report on it -- is on the last --
second-to-the-last paragraph in regard to

13 communication between regions, and also the
resolution that had been passed by various

14 councils in the Eastern, Yukon/Kuskokwim and
Western Interior. We will get a report on

15 this. It's on our agenda.

16 MR. TUTIAKOFF: I move to accept
the chair's report.

17

18 MS. TRUMBLE: A motion made by
Vince Tutiakoff to accept the report,
chair's report.

19 Second?

20 MR. GUNDERSON: I'll second.

21 MS. TRUMBLE: Second by Paul
Gunderson.

22 Discussion?

23 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Question.

24 MS. TRUMBLE: The question has
been called. All in favor signify by saying

25 "aye."

1 COUNCIL MEMBERS: Aye.

2 MS. TRUMBLE: Opposed, same sign.
Motion carries.

3 Next item on the agenda, election
4 of officers.

5 MS. CHIVERS: At this time we'll
open the floor for nominations of the chair.
6 I can do it by secret ballot or by voting.
I'm not sure how you want to handle that.
7 Do you want me to go over the duties of the
chair?

8 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Nominate -- I
move to nominate Della.

9 MR. CRATTY: Second.

10 Move to close, by unanimous consent.
Talk about a railroad.

11 MS. TRUMBLE: Apparently, I'm
12 accepting. So....
Thank you.

13 I'd like to open the floor for
nominations for vice chair.

14 MR. SQUARTSOFF: I nominate Paul
15 Gunderson.

16 MR. CRATTY: Second.

17 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Move to close.
Unanimous consent.

18 MS. TRUMBLE: He's got the flu,
19 so he'll accept.

20 MR. GUNDERSON: Can't argue.

21 MR. SQUARTSOFF: You do a
wonderful job.

22 MS. TRUMBLE: I'd like to open
23 the floor for nominations for secretary.

24 MR. TUTIAKOFF: It was Gilda.

25 MS. TRUMBLE: Gilda's term is
going to be up in probably January. This

1 would have been her last meeting. She is
2 not re-applying for her seat.

3 MR. CRATTY: I nominate Pete
4 Squartsoff.

5 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Second.

6 MR. GUNDERSON: Make a motion.
7 My motion is to close.

8 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Second.

9 MS. TRUMBLE: All in favor,
10 signify by saying "aye."

11 COUNCIL MEMBERS: Aye.

12 MS. TRUMBLE: Next item on the
13 agenda is public testimony, and this time
14 the floor is open to public comments about
15 the Federal Subsistence program. And there
16 are forms on the table to fill out for
17 public testimony. We do and have allowed it
18 to continue on through the whole meeting.
19 So, if anybody has anything they would like
20 to --

21 At this rate, we're going to be
22 done here by 10:00 o'clock, guys.

23 The item on the agenda is special
24 action, WSA01-01, Tab G.

25 MR. JENNINGS: Madam Chair, Tim
Jennings here. I would like to provide a
little bit of background information to set
the stage for this, and then Dave Fisher,
wildlife biologist, will provide a brief
overview of the staff analysis and be able
to answer any questions that you may have
about staff analysis.

If you turn under Tab G, you'll
see on the second and third page, this was a
request of special action by the council,
the Kodiak/Aleutians Regional Advisory
Council, which came from your meeting in Old
Harbor. And, basically, there was concern
expressed about the health of the deer
population on Kodiak. Several successive
winters of severe weather which resulted in
high mortality and -- so there was a concern

1 about the population dramatically
decreasing.

2 And to promote the recovery, the
council requested that the current harvest
3 limit of deer, which was five deer, be
reduced to three deer. And in addition, the
4 council referenced a letter received from
the Kodiak Fish & Game Advisory Committee
5 seeking support of their proposal No. 186 to
the Alaska Board of Game where the State
6 reduced the deer harvest in order to speed
recovery of the deer herd. At the March
7 2001 meeting, the Alaska Board of Game did
reduce the harvest limit under State
8 regulations in Unit 8 from four deer to
three.

9 The Federal Subsistence Board
took up and discussed and approved the
10 special action request on June 15th, and
they reduced the harvest limits for deer in
11 Unit 8 from five to three. However, under
regulations, the board action was only good
12 or valid for 60 days without a public
hearing.

13 So, where we stood was the board
reduced the harvest limits for the first 60
14 days of the season so the limit of three was
in effect from August 1 to September 29.

15 And then because of our regulations
requiring a public hearing in the affected
16 area, in order to extend the reduction of
harvest limits for the entire season there
17 was a public hearing held in Kodiak on
August 28th in order to allow public
18 testimony and comment on this harvest
reduction, and you have the minutes, I
19 believe, before you of that August the 28th
meeting. Alaska Department of Fish & Game
20 was also there, Larry VanDaele, and a couple
members of the public.

21 So, where we -- I think that
provides sort of the backdrop, and where we
22 stand now is the council, since it was your
request, you were the maker of the request
23 for the special action, you can take up this
action again and reaffirm that your request
24 to the Federal Board is to extend this
reduction for the entire season of 2001/2002
25 hunting season. Or you can modify that
request if you see fit. There's been a

1 request, as you may note in the minutes of
2 this Kodiak meeting, August 28th, a request
3 from the Alaska Department of Fish & Game to
4 modify -- modify the request.

5 And I think I'll stop there and
6 see if Dave has anything he wants to add and
7 can provide a little bit of background in
8 terms of biological information that's in
9 the staff analysis.

Dave?

10 MR. FISHER: Yes. Thanks, Tim.
11 I don't have too much to add. Tim pretty
12 much discussed a little bit of the
13 background. I can give you a background.
14 As you know the current population is
15 currently recovering from our severe winters
16 of '97 and '98 and '99. Prior to that the
17 population was somewhere close to 80 to
18 100,000 animals. I got this information
19 from Larry VanDaele at the public meeting.
20 The population was estimated there. The
21 current population is about 40,000-plus. As
22 we all know, the population is a function of
23 winter weather and mortalities that are
24 related to that.

25 The weather patterns have been
better here the last couple of years, and
the population is recovering as noted by
hunters. And also Robert Stovall's winter
mortality index surveys may indicate that.
He may want to chat a little bit on that
when he talks. The population is
recovering.

Annual harvests over the years
have averaged somewhere between 7- and 9,000
animals with about half of the harvest
occurring on refuge lands.

During the past five years, '95
through '99, the harvest has been around
5600 animals.

The '99-2000 harvest was around
3700, and harvest estimated for the year
2000/2001 are around 2500.

That's basically all I have.

I know we've talked about this at
our last several meetings, and I'll
entertain any questions that anybody has.

MS. TRUMBLE: Do you have any

1 questions from the council?

2 MR. GUNDERSON: Reductions in the
3 take of the animals, is that caused by the
4 size of the herd decreasing?

5 MR. FISHER: Yes, primarily.

6 MR. TUTIAKOFF: To have a special
7 action, we have 40 days --

8 MR. JENNINGS: 60.

9 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Now that's over
10 with.

11 MR. JENNINGS: It will stay in
12 effect until September 29th.

13 MR. TUTIAKOFF: This process that
14 we're going through now will extend it.

15 MR. JENNINGS: For the remaining
16 of hunting season, this year's hunting
17 season.

18 MR. TUTIAKOFF: We will have to
19 address it again next year.

20 MR. JENNINGS: If you wish to
21 have it extended more than the one season,
22 then you would need or someone would need to
23 put in a permanent proposal for permanent
24 regulations change. Right now, the window,
25 the opportunity to submit a wildlife
proposal is open and we'll have that
opportunity later in the agenda to address
proposals.

MR. TUTIAKOFF: I know you had a
concern about that when you were asking me
about the -- having a permit system. Maybe
when we get to that proposal, we ought to
talk about it in the proposal.

23 Thanks.

24 MR. JENNINGS: Also, I might
25 mention that Della and Al were at the
meeting in Kodiak, and I don't know if
either of you would like to add anything

1 about that meeting in terms of testimony
or --

2

MS. TRUMBLE: I think, basically,
3 their request -- it's stated in the minutes,
they wanted to line -- to mirror the Federal
4 regulations -- adjust it to mirror the State
harvest limits so that deer can be managed
5 without complications and basically hunters
in the area operating under two different
6 sets of regulations, that was basically the
other issue in regard to this; and we told
7 them that we'd bring it up to this council
at this meeting. So that's open for
8 discussion also.

Al?

9

MR. CRATTY: Yeah, same thing you
10 said. Like you said, on the proposal,
should present a proposal to the -- on the
11 game -- on this material, due to the
State -- I think they had a two-year deal on
12 it, when the Board of Game meets again, when
they knocked down the deer limit that it
13 would change in two years. I think we
should follow the guidelines with them.
14 They're worried about it with sportsmen and
everything.

I mean, instead of having to go
15 60 days here, 60 days there, like you said.

16 It would only go through next year, then
we'd have to go through it again. Why don't
17 we just follow right through with what the
State's doing?

18

MR. SQUARTSOFF: I have no
19 problem with it going through, an extension
for the remainder of this season and
20 understanding that fish & wildlife, Kodiak
was going to put in a proposal. So, I have
21 no problem at all. But I'm not -- I don't
support any amendments to what we have now.

22

MR. FISHER: You're in favor of
23 just an extension of the special action?

24 MR. SQUARTSOFF: The way it is.

25 MR. FISHER: Until the end of the
season.

1 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Until the end of
2 the season.

3 MR. FISHER: And extending the
4 proposal. I think the refuge is working on
that. I think Robert will discuss that too.

5 MS. TRUMBLE: Any other
6 questions?

7 MR. JENNINGS: I think, it might
be useful if the council would, I think, go
on record, take an action to recommend to
8 the Federal board a recommendation in terms
of what to do with this. The Board is
9 scheduled to meet next Friday, the 28th, to
take up this action. If the council
10 recommends the Board -- since the council
was the requester of the special action, to
11 extend it through the remainder of the
season, I think it would be good to just
12 have a motion and officially have a council
recommendation to the Board how you see fit.

13 MR. SQUARTSOFF: I so move for an
14 extension.

15 MS. TRUMBLE: We've got --
there's no written public testimony or AD &
16 G comments or public testimony?

17 MR. JENNINGS: We can cover
18 that --

19 MS. CHIVERS: There are no
written public comments at this time.

20 MR. JENNINGS: We received no
written public -- right. Sorry, Madam
21 Chair.

22 MS. TRUMBLE: I have to do it
this way, following your orders.

23 MR. JENNINGS: Yes.

24 MS. TRUMBLE: Okay. No written
25 public testimony --

1 MR. JENNINGS: And the public
testimony that we have received is from the
2 Kodiak public hearing meeting. The minutes
are before you. I don't know if any members
3 of the public would like to address this
issue here, this meeting, the opportunities
4 here at this time.

5 MS. TRUMBLE: Okay. Hearing
council recommendation, justification.
6 Pete?

7 MR. SQUARTSOFF: I make a motion
to extend WSA01-01 for the remainder of the
8 2000, 2001 season -- 2001, 2002, I guess.
January?

9 MR. FISHER: 2002.

10 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Request no
11 amendments.

12 MR. LUKIN: Second.

13 MS. TRUMBLE: Seconded by Ivan.
Discussion?
14 Call for question?

15 MR. GUNDERSON: Question.

16 MS. TRUMBLE: All in favor
signify by saying "aye."

17 COUNCIL MEMBERS: Aye.

18 MS. TRUMBLE: Opposed, same sign.
19 Motion carries.

20 MR. JENNINGS: Madam Chair, one
follow-up item. Since the Board will meet
21 in work session next Friday to discuss this,
would you or a member of the council want to
22 be on teleconference when the Board
discusses this issue next Friday? If so, we
23 can arrange that.

24 MS. TRUMBLE: I can be. I would
really, if possible, like Pete to also be
25 available on the phone.

1 MR. JENNINGS: Tentatively, it's
scheduled for 10:00 a.m.

2 MR. SQUARTSOFF: I've got plans
3 next Friday.

4 MR. FISHER: Come listen in a
little bit --

5 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Put it on the
6 radio.

7 MS. TRUMBLE: Ivan, could you be
available next Friday at 10:00 a.m. for a
8 conference call?

9 MR. LUKIN: This coming Friday?

10 MS. TRUMBLE: Next Friday.

11 MR. SQUARTSOFF: A week from
tomorrow.

12 MR. LUKIN: I might.

13 MR. JENNINGS: We'll coordinate
14 with you.

15 MS. TRUMBLE: If not, I can do
it.

16 MR. JENNINGS: Thank you, Madam
17 Chair.

18 MS. TRUMBLE: Thank you.
Next item on the agenda is call
19 for a proposal to change Federal subsistence
wildlife regulations, Tab H.

20 MS. TRUMBLE: Michelle -- there
21 isn't anything at this time?

22 MS. CHIVERS: We have proposal
forms available if the public would like to
23 submit a proposal. At this point, you know,
you were talking about looking at permanent
24 regulations.

25 MR. JENNINGS: So far to date,
we've not received any proposals from the

1 public in this region. But typically, we
2 don't receive proposals until near the
3 deadline; and the deadline is October 26th.
4 So, at this time, we're not aware of any
5 proposals from the public.

6 MR. TUTIAKOFF: It's open until
7 October 29th.

8 MR. JENNINGS: 29th? 26th.

9 MS. TRUMBLE: Tim -- excuse me,
10 Robert, just for a second.

11 One of the items in here -- this
12 is kind of, I think, where we're having a
13 bit of a problem; and I know we talked a
14 little bit about this in our workshop
15 yesterday; and technically, it's in regard
16 to the refuge managers not being present.
17 When you look through the report and you
18 look at the issue of the moose and the ten
19 permits that are going to be drawn, they're
20 going to allow for 20. This is under State
21 regulations. Eighteen permits were handed
22 out. Five of those permits were outside of
23 our region. There's five of them from
24 Anchorage, one from Kodiak, one from
25 Southeast somewhere, one from Wasilla, one
from Palmer, I think is what the lineup is.
But to try to address those without the
refuge managers or to try to work some
proposals to try to work with the State,
we're kind of at a loss. Maybe when we take
our break, we could work with the staff or
something to look at that and try to put
together a proposal.

One of the things we try to do
when we have our council meetings, because
they're so spread out, every six months to
try to get some of this paperwork together
while we're all here and staff is available
to help.

But, we were looking, basically
at that moose one earlier.

Just a comment, maybe we could go
back to that sometime today.

Robert?

MR. STOVALL: Madam Chair, Robert
Stovall, Kodiak National Wildlife Refuge,

1 subsistence biologist.

2 The refuge is planning on
3 submitting a proposal to simplify the deer
4 regulations and the Federal subsistence
5 regulations. The proposal would more or
6 less make all of Kodiak National Wildlife
7 Refuge one unit, one deer management unit;
8 and then anything that's off of the refuge
9 would be considered another unit under State
10 regulations.

11 And we'd also simplify the doe
12 harvests to read either sex harvests of
13 deer.

14 The only thing that we will --
15 we're willing to consult with the regional
16 advisory council on is the number of deer to
17 be harvested. We'd like to try to set that
18 and keep that the same for as many years as
19 possible, barring any unforeseen calamities.

20 The proposal is not written yet;
21 and, basically, I was going to get with you,
22 regional advisory council members,
23 particularly the ones from Kodiak, to
24 discuss the harvest limits.

25 And I just wanted to point out,
26 Dave's -- Dave Fisher's information about
27 the size of the deer population is very
28 speculative just from the standpoint that
29 there's no hard population numbers, and it's
30 something the refuge is working on trying to
31 come up with a method to do a deer count or
32 a deer population estimate and develop the
33 methodology to do that. That's something
34 we're working hard on to do.

35 The population two years ago was
36 estimated to be around 40,000; and that
37 population has definitely increased since
38 then. I've talked with Larry VanDaele about
39 it and asked him what he thought the
40 population was at this present point in
41 time. He gave a number of 60,000 animals,
42 based on what he's observed, what he's
43 getting from the information from other
44 hunters that have been out in the field,
45 based on mortalities that he's observed, and
46 information that he's gotten from the
47 refuge.

48 And, quite frankly, I had
49 concurred with that. That was a number that
50 I was going to give too. Without having

1 hard, solid numbers, an estimate, it's
2 only -- an estimate would be around 60,000
3 animals, is what the population is standing
4 on right now, based on how it's been
5 recovering.

6 MS. TRUMBLE: Thank you, Robert.
7 Any questions for Robert?
8 Ivan?

9 MR. LUKIN: I think the question
10 I have or concern, I guess you might say, is
11 hunters are coming on the island from off
12 the island. I would think that it's a
13 problem for -- especially in our area where
14 it appears to be a lull during those last
15 two winters, on the animals in the area.
16 I don't feel that they should be
17 allowed to take, you know, the same amount
18 of animals we are that live on the island.
19 I think we need to look at other -- again, I
20 think I mentioned it a meeting or so ago,
21 look at other states and see what -- what
22 their regulations are as far as -- you know,
23 nonresident hunters.

24 I don't believe that they're
25 taking -- many of them are not allowed to
26 come into other states and take more than
27 one animal. I think it would help us
28 tremendously if we looked at something like
29 that as far as protecting certain areas,
30 especially areas that are really hard hit.

31 I mean, we've got the ferry
32 running there -- there in Port Lions, it's
33 been a problem, people come off and get back
34 on with a vehicle-load, truckloads of deer
35 that hurt our area.

36 MR. SQUARTSOFF: I just have a
37 little comment on that, Ivan. Port Lions,
38 we're on state land, regulated by State.
39 All of these hunters coming over are state
40 residents. I guess you'd have to drop the
41 number for everybody because it's residents
42 of the State and the north end of Kodiak is
43 all State land.

44 MR. LUKIN: Back to that
45 traditional deal again. It makes it hard
46 again.

1 MR. SQUARTSOFF: I'm just -- it
2 is State, and they're all coming over --
3 there might be a few out-of-state people,
4 but I think the biggest amount of people
5 coming to Port Lions are state residents.

6 MR. LUKIN: It's hurt us bad.

7 MR. SQUARTSOFF: I agree. I'm
8 just saying that it is state residents that
9 are coming over. So that would have to go
10 through the State, not Federal.

11 MR. LUKIN: It's a concern that
12 I've had. I've seen it. Whether it be
13 State land or whoever's land, it's a
14 problem.

15 MR. STOVALL: The State has
16 restricted the area around Port Lions, I do
17 believe, the same as the road system, to one
18 buck only for the next two years.

19 MR. LUKIN: Access into Federal
20 lands, it's affecting the Federal lands as
21 well as the State land.

22 MR. STOVALL: That access is
23 going to be curtailed. We're working with
24 law enforcement to not allow ATV's on the
25 refuge land from that Port Lions area. It's
going to be monitored, and enforcement
actions are going to happen in that area.

We have a pretty good idea where
they're going. We can see the trails from
the air.

The State is going to have that
restriction in place for two years, this
year and next year. And the only other
restriction is that they cannot hunt on
Federal lands in January, only residents --
that's the only advantage that Federal
regulations has for the subsistence users.

MR. SIMEONOFF: I've got another
question. Is there anything in the works
for limiting the number of hunters that come
in? In Kodiak Island we have charter boats
coming in from Kodiak, Homer, everywhere;
and they're there until the end of the deer

1 season using the amphibious aircraft to
bring in their people; and they stay at
2 certain areas. And when the village people
go hunting, they kind of avoid those areas,
3 because there's so much hunter traffic in
there.

4
MR. STOVALL: We don't really
5 have any regulations to monitor or --
besides the enforcement activities that we
6 can do. We don't have the ability to
regulate the marine transporters. And
7 that's who you're talking about. They're
coming in from Homer. We're aware of them.
8 We do monitor their actions. We started
monitoring their action, I should say. The
9 last couple of years we've been doing that.
We don't have the regulatory authority over
10 them, though; the State does.

Besides the opportunity to
11 harvest in January, which they do not have,
that's the only way we would be able to
12 regulate it, basically.

13 MR. SQUARTSOFF: My only thing
was, you know, you guys say you can't
14 enforce it; but they are coming and hunting
on Federal lands. You can't enforce the
15 waters, the marine thing, but they're
putting it on shore. So....

16
MR. STOVALL: I guess the -- to
17 restrict the public off of Federal lands, we
have to show -- we have to show that the
18 rural priority is not being allowed on the
Federal lands. That the deer that Mitch --
19 and the villages around the area that Mitch
is talking about aren't able to get the deer
20 that they need for the subsistence, and do
you feel that that has become a problem?
21 Were you not able to get the deer at all?

22 MR. SIMEONOFF: It's a problem in
the sense that there are hunters everywhere.
23 And we're -- aside from a little area around
the village, which the people don't like to
24 hunt. We can just go from the village to
hunt, but we like to travel a little ways to
25 go hunting. But in order to do that, you
got to -- when you see those charter boats

1 from the mainland, they have four, five
2 people up on land already. And you can see
3 when they're there, and they end up going
4 further and further away. And nobody is --
5 you know, not that we can see, nobody is
6 asking them if they have, you know, proper
7 permits and everything to be there. As far
8 as we know, they're just bringing people
9 from wherever and dropping them off.

10 MR. STOVALL: Okay. I will speak
11 with the refuge manager and find out what we
12 can or can't do and try and get back with
13 you folks. I'm not exactly sure what we can
14 or can't do. I will speak to her about the
15 problem.

16 MS. TRUMBLE: Okay. I think that
17 coffee should be just about done back there,
18 so maybe take a ten-minute break before we
19 get into the review of the customary trade.
20 Both of those items may take a little time.

21 (Break.)

22 MS. TRUMBLE: Okay. If you're
23 ready, we'll call the meeting back to order.
24 Before we move on, I think we'll have Dan
25 LaPlant talk about putting proposals
together to submit to the State Board of
Game.

MR. LAPLANT: Thank you, Madam
Chair, members of the council. My name is
Dan LaPlant. I'm the liaison with the Board
of Game. I work with the office of
subsistence management. While you're on the
subject of talking about proposals, I
thought I'd take the opportunity to tell you
what the Board of Game schedule is for
accepting proposals and considering
proposals for your area.

The issue that was just discussed
was mentioned that the State intended to
have that in place for at least two years,
and take it up again after that period.

So, the next scheduled meeting of
the Board of Game to discuss Southcentral
issues is scheduled for March of 2003. So
the deadline for submitting proposals for

1 that meeting would be probably in January of
2003.

2 Board of Game does meet prior to
that a few times, and you can always submit
3 a change of agenda request to them to take
up issues out of their cycle.

4 Those issues probably have better
success of being considered if it comes to
5 you through the regional advisory
committee -- State Fish & Game Advisory
6 Committee. You might consider that.

7 Anyway, the next meeting of the
Board of Game is going to be in November in
Kotzebue, and actually their deadline for
8 proposals set for that meeting is August.
The requirement for agenda request is 45
9 days prior to the meeting. It might just be
enough time if you had a real dire need to
10 get something on their agenda. There's a
possibility anyway.

11 In January of 2001, they have a
meeting --

12 MR. JENNINGS: 2002.

13 MR. LAPLANT: Excuse me, 2002.

14 They have a meeting that would be
considering statewide issues. The deadline
15 for submitting proposals for that meeting is
October 26th. Next month.

16 Then they have another meeting in
March of 2002 for considering proposals that
17 affect the interior regions of the state.
And the deadline for submitting those
18 proposals is December 7th, 2001; so that's
kind of just a brief rundown of what their
19 brief schedule is for accepting proposals.

20 MS. TRUMBLE: Any questions for
Dan?

21 MR. SQUARTSOFF: I didn't get
22 that one after January.

23 MR. LAPLANT: March 2002, they
have a meeting for interior Alaska issues.
24 The deadline for submitting proposals for
that meeting is December 7th.

25 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Where is that

1 going to be at?

2 MR. LAPLANT: In Fairbanks.

3 MS. TRUMBLE: Thank you, Dan.
4 We'll move on the agenda, and the
5 next item is: Review of proposed fisheries
6 monitoring projects for fiscal year 2002,
7 Tab I.

8 MR. FRIED: Good morning, Madam
9 Chair, members of the council.

10 Under Tab I is the fisheries --
11 it's the draft fisheries monitoring plan for
12 the year 2002, and basically, what it
13 consists of are the recommendations from the
14 technical review committee on what studies
15 to fund for the 2- -- the beginning of the
16 2002 field season.

17 Basically, what the council needs
18 to consider and take action on on the plan
19 is whether or not they agree with the
20 recommendations from the technical review
21 committee and, if not, you know, what
22 recommendations does the council have for
23 the studies that are different.

24 There's quite a bit of
25 information under Tab I. The first part is
an introduction that just sort of gives a
broad overview of the total program,
including how studies are ranked, basically
the strategic priority of the study, whether
or not there's an important issue or
information need. The technical scientific
merit, the past performance and experience
of the investigators proposing the plan, and
the partnership capacity building aspects of
the study.

26 If you turn to page 11, there's
27 actually an overview of the proposed studies
28 for the Bristol Bay, Alaska Peninsula, and
29 the Kodiak Aleutians Alaska region. And in
30 this, and also in a handout that I provided,
31 which is -- talks about the overview.

32 There's a map on page 12 that shows the
33 geographic distribution of the proposed
34 studies, and also in the box that has the
35 title and number of the study, whether or
36 not the technical review committee
37 recommended the study for funding or not.

1 And then there's also two tables on the
 2 preceding pages, pages 13 and 14, that
 actually lists the studies.

And what we've done is put the
 3 studies for Bristol Bay/Alaskan Peninsula
 separately by types. Table 1 has the stock
 4 status abundance studies. You can see the
 one for Bristol Bay and the study for
 5 Kodiak/Aleutians. There's two proposals
 advanced for this information type.

6 One was for estimating sockeye
 and coho escapement into Thin Point Lake,
 7 which is in the Izembek National Wildlife
 Refuge.

8 The other one is the seasonal use
 by inshore habitats of Red King crabs which
 9 was actually a study that wasn't funded last
 year. That was reconsidered for funding
 10 this year.

Table 2 has all of the harvest
 11 monitoring, traditional ecological studies.
 There were three of these. One of them was
 12 for Bristol Bay; one for Kodiak; and there
 was actually one that actually had both
 13 areas included within this type of study.

And you can see in the tables,
 14 the ones that were recommended are in bold
 type, and there's a column selected. It
 15 says "yes" or "no." The ones in bold type
 that say "yes" are the ones that have been
 16 selected for a recommendation by the
 technical review committee based on whether
 17 or not they felt that there appears to be a
 need for the information, and the study was
 18 sound, that the investigators were
 qualified, and that there were good
 19 opportunities in here to build capacity
 within the local area.

20 I don't know what else to -- I
 don't know if you really had time to look
 21 these over. For every study here, there's a
 description in the back which begins on page
 22 21 that actually shows the investigating
 agency or organization, what the issue is
 23 that the study is supposed to address, the
 objectives of the study. A little short one
 24 on the methods, what sort of products would
 come out of this, whether or not it's a
 25 report or a CD-ROM database, or some other
 product. A little bit about the experience

1 of investigators and the partnership
2 collaborations consultation that also
3 occurred. And also, lastly, is the
4 justification on why or why not the
5 technical review committee selected this
6 project to fund or not to fund.
7 I don't know how the council
8 would like to do this, if you -- if you want
9 to consider the ones for Bristol Bay or you
10 just want to focus on the ones for
11 Kodiak/Aleutians.

12 MS. TRUMBLE: My guess is to
13 focus on the ones from Kodiak/Aleutians.
14 Al, where is your proposal that
15 you had? Is it in here?

16 MR. SQUARTSOFF: I don't think
17 it's in here.

18 MR. CRATTY: Probably wasn't
19 accepted.

20 MS. TRUMBLE: That's a question.

21 MR. FRIED: I can explain --

22 MS. TRUMBLE: I think it's --
23 maybe if it's possible in the future all of
24 the proposals for our region that were put
25 together should possibly go into our books
so we can talk about why they're not
accepted.

18 MR. FRIED: What -- I guess, just
19 to talk about the process in place right
20 now, what happens is -- a call for proposals
21 goes out. The proposals come in. OSM staff
22 goes through the proposals and kind of
23 groups them and makes some recommendations.
24 And what happens next is that these go to
25 the technical review committee, and they
actually select a group of proposals to have
an investigation plan prepared. The ones
that don't -- that aren't recommended for
investigation plan, that's as far as that
proposal goes that year.

So, what's before you now are the
investigation plans, and the proposals that
weren't advanced to that stage, you know,

1 aren't even here to be considered any
longer.

2 And the way the technical review
committee makes their suggestions is trying
3 to go through the issues that have been
identified by the council members and public
4 and some other agencies to see whether or
not they're addressing an important need.

5 What happens is too -- is the Federal
Subsistence Board has made recommendations
6 on what sort of studies and issues can be
addressed by this program, which ones are
7 better addressed elsewhere.

8 What the subsistence board is
looking for are projects that specifically
support Federal subsistence management. And
9 any project -- any project that addresses a
resource or an issue that's not under
10 Federal jurisdiction is not considered. And
also they specifically identified three
11 different areas that they were not
interested in having this program fund.

12 One of these was fish
propagation, restoration, enhancement, and
13 that speaks to the study that was presented
by the investigators from Old Harbor.

14 And the other two areas are
habitat protection, restoration and
15 enhancement. They thought those were best
handled by the issues.

16 Another hot issue would be
contaminant assessment, monitoring,
17 pollution and those sort of things.

18 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Can we change
the location of that -- there's other areas
19 in Old Harbor where there's a small amount
of sockeye, to build those, instead of a new
20 area that was proposed.

21 MR. FRIED: It's my understanding
when the Board made that decision last
22 December is that they're not interested in
funding any restoration efforts. If you
23 wanted to put in an in-stream incubator from
that, or restock a lake, it's my -- what the
24 Board said. This is not appropriate for
them to do that.

25 MR. SQUARTSOFF: I'm reading

1 about the king crab study in Kodiak. I
2 think studying sockeye salmon used in Old
3 Harbor instead of studying king crab
4 crawling around in Womens Bay in Kodiak is
5 better.

6 MS. TRUMBLE: I'm going to be
7 very honest here. The person that helped us
8 put that proposal together, helped Al,
9 specifically, I think, put that proposal
10 together, and I did sit in on part of a
11 hearing or discussion or meeting or
12 discussion or hearing by teleconference, and
13 he was basically the person that opposed the
14 restoration of -- so I have some problems
15 with -- why did we go through all of that
16 and get that paperwork, when basically
17 the -- he was basically the person that was
18 going to oppose it? I guess if we had some
19 sense of what was coming down, that we
20 probably wouldn't have gone through that
21 whole process that we did. I can speak
22 about it way more at some point in time.

23 MR. FRIED: I think that's what
24 Steve Klein asked the Board at the last work
25 session that they had. What sort of
studies -- does this fit with what the board
is looking for?

MS. TRUMBLE: I did hear him say
specifically, as a recommendation to not
accept a restoration project as part of --
when they were making a determination of
which types to take into consideration.
But that's something we can keep
in mind, I think, in the future.

MR. FRIED: This is basically a
new program, the first year, 2000. All that
happened is proposals came in. I wasn't
there at the time. They, basically, funded
things right from the proposals, just went
through the board. I don't think the
council had an opportunity because of the
calendar and the desire to get things --
projects going right away, to even have a
say.

Then the next year, which was
last year, we had to have a special meeting

1 in February to get council input. This year
2 we're back on a more normal schedule and
3 calendar. All I can say is that if you
4 don't agree with these issues that the Board
5 has identified, I'm assuming you can request
6 that the Board, you know, reconsider their
7 decision and fund these things.

8 But right now, that's the
9 instructions that have been handed down by
10 the Board. They're the ones that make the
11 final funding decisions.

12 That's why that particular
13 project isn't before us.

14 MS. TRUMBLE: I think the other
15 issue that concerns me in regard to this, if
16 you look at -- because they've got us in one
17 region or one group, the Bristol Bay,
18 Alaska, Kodiak/Aleutians. The bulk of this
19 funding basically goes to Bristol Bay.
20 Whether we can somehow split that to half
21 and half that we have some -- a certain
22 amount of funding that can at least -- we
23 can use to -- or at least forecast to put
24 proposals together within our region,
25 because it's something to think about in the
future.

MR. FRIED: That's been put
before the board also. And they've been
unwilling to split this particular
geographic area into separate regions.

MS. TRUMBLE: I think we split
the biologist.

MR. FRIED: Actually, I don't
know -- I serve Bristol Bay. I serve
Kodiak. I also do all of the North Slope,
northwest Arctic.

MS. TRUMBLE: We need to look at
that.

MR. FRIED: When a TRC has been
looking at this, even if you look at the
funding recommendation they made now, the
funding is actually fairly equally split
between the two. There's two projects in
Bristol Bay; but, you know, the total value

1 of those for funding in 2002 is about
\$68,000. The king crab study is \$65,000.
2 That's pretty close.

And then the one that they
3 selected for harvest monitoring, TEK, is
actually a study that goes among both areas.

4 I mean, they've made some efforts
on their own to try to somehow get some
5 parity, but....

6 MR. LUKIN: Excuse me, that money
that they're talking about there, is that
7 just basically study and administration or
what? I mean, what does it cost to take
8 in -- let's say Al is interested in stocking
a lake there. What's it going to cost them
9 to actually take the fry or whatever and
stock that lake, whatever he's planning on
10 doing?

11 MS. TRUMBLE: I think when we did
this, Ivan -- I'm not sure if you were
12 there, because when we're all there in
Anchorage, we understand that we couldn't
13 enhance -- do an enhancement. The project
that Al had put together for a proposal was
14 a feasibility study, because technically
there wouldn't be funding to actually do the
15 enhancement.

16 MR. FRIED: I think it's my
understanding, it was to start an early run
17 of sockeye.

18 MR. CRATTY: It was a feasibility
study. It was to go on if the study did
19 pass. We were going to go on with the
Kodiak Agricultural Center and the Alaska
20 Department of Fish & Game to go ahead and --
you know, if the feasibility study was
21 passed, to go on and work with the Kodiak
Agricultural Association and Alaska
22 Department of Fish and Game to go ahead and
try and enhance that system.

23
24 MR. FRIED: Aside from the
Board's decision not to fund studies that do
things like that, I mean, there is some
25 question about starting a brand-new run and
then how to do C and T findings around

1 things that didn't exist before.

2 MR. CRATTY: The whole deal
3 with -- everywhere on Kodiak Island has got
4 subsistence reds but Old Harbor. That was
5 the whole issue on the deal. We were trying
6 to enhance the early red run for the people.
7 If we want to get our spring reds, we have
8 to go to Alitak or Old Letnik.

9 There's not much I can do because
10 the Board already has said they won't fund
11 things like that. If you go back to the
12 Federal regulations too, on subsistence, it
13 speaks to wildlife populations --

14 MR. SQUARTSOFF: There's a lot of
15 people living in that community that don't
16 have boats like Al that can go and get the
17 salmon in the early spring.

18 MR. FRIED: Like I say, I think
19 you might need to have some more discussion
20 with the Federal Subsistence Board.

21 MR. SIMEONOFF: I've got a
22 question.

23 MS. TRUMBLE: Speridon?

24 MR. SIMEONOFF: If Your program
25 is not funding program proposals like this,
do you know which program would fund the
feasibility study?

MR. FRIED: For the State, I
would guess, you know, there's a possibility
of getting money through Fish & Game or some
other funding programs that they operate.

20 Through the Federal government --
21 I'm not sure if there's funding through the
22 refuge of fisheries on refuge land. I'm
23 looking for --

24 MR. STOVALL: That's never been a
25 priority for enhancement projects. They
have done it in the past going through an
environmental assessment process. It's
something that we've always worked with
the -- the State has brought that up to us,
and then we went through the environmental

1 assessment process to see if that's feasible
2 to do, and compatible.

3 MR. FRIED: I don't know. Maybe
4 that's a tough issue. The State used to
5 have within Fish & Game a division that was
6 devoted to enhancement development of
7 fisheries. They melded that with the
8 commercial fisheries division. They turned
9 over all their state hatcheries to private
10 funders -- nonprofits. The private
11 nonprofit hatchery associations get most of
12 them to do fisheries, to access some of the
13 cash. And also doing the cost recovery for
14 hatcheries, there's not a big link between
15 that program and subsistence.

16 MR. THOMPSON: I think in
17 Southeast, there's an organization called
18 AREG. They're doing a lot of egg planting,
19 enhancement-type work. They've worked on
20 agreements with Hoonah, Kake, tribal
21 organizations. I think they're this summer
22 doing some of that preliminary work. There
23 may be some money through the inter-tribal
24 council. And they're trying to form a
25 statewide umbrella on that. I do have some
literature on that that I would definitely
forward to you. I think it may help to
serve your purpose.

MS. TRUMBLE: I'm going to go
ahead and go through each of these
separately or discuss them.

MR. FRIED: Whatever way you'd
like to do it.

MS. TRUMBLE: If there's any
questions or comments in regards to any of
them.

MR. CONNOLLY: I'm going to
run --

MS. TRUMBLE: Dick?

MR. JACOBSEN: If you did the
study -- if you did the study, you may find
out that you may not try to create something

1 new. There may be reds before. You're just
2 recapping something. The funding source may
3 change if the study was done. The red
4 salmon in the Kodiak area is early. So, if
5 there was ever a red before, you can
6 document, that whole approach may change.

7 MS. TRUMBLE: Good point.

8 MR. FRIED: That is a good point.
9 It could come to light in some of the --
10 people remembered that there was a run there
11 earlier, maybe it's not there. Until the
12 Board changes its stance, they're still not
13 willing to fund rehab.

14 MS. TRUMBLE: I think if we can
15 establish that, we can at least go back with
16 it.

17 Is this 01-009, the first one
18 that's ours in here?

19 MR. FRIED: 01-009 and 01-207.
20 Those are the two stock status and trend
21 investigation proposed studies before you.

22 MS. TRUMBLE: Page 21, Tab I.

23 MR. FRIED: Page 21 would be
24 crab.
25 Page 30 would be Thin Point.

MS. TRUMBLE: Do we have any
comment on 01-009?

MR. SQUARTSOFF: I know when we
discussed this one before, we talked about
it, we thought that Kodiak -- we felt like
we would rather have a salmon program for
the south end of the island instead of this
king crab study for Kodiak.

MR. FRIED: But that was not --
like I said, that's not on the table. TRC
couldn't do anything.

MR. SQUARTSOFF: Those king crab
are in Womens Bay. They've been there all
along. I guess they want to monitor how the
sea otters eat them, but the sea otters are
declining.

1 MR. FRIED: Womens Bay is one of
2 the few places around Kodiak where there are
3 king crab there.

4 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Coast guard give
5 their people boats and put out pots.

6 MR. CRATTY: The whole south end
7 of Kodiak Island is full of king crab.
8 They're still allowing the dragger down
9 there. I'd go down there when I was pot
10 catching cod. My pots were coming up plumb
11 full of king crab.

12 MR. SQUARTSOFF: That's why you
13 need the study.

14 MR. FRIED: The proposal for the
15 study is within the national wildlife
16 refuge. Alaska National Wildlife Maritime
17 Refuge. And the investigators indicated
18 that it is one of the few places remaining
19 where people can go subsistence crab fishing
20 around Kodiak and they don't really
21 understand, you know, how -- is it a
22 population that's in that bay or is it just
23 a nursery area or just, you know, what the
24 relationships are in that area.

25 And they actually reduced the
amount of money they were asking for last
year by quite a bit and have come up with a
bunch of their own matching funds to do the
work.

26 You know, it's either this study
27 or a study on placing a weir on Thin Point
28 Lake on Izembek. The technical review
29 committee -- they just funded one in 2001 to
30 put a weir on Mortensens Creek, maybe they
31 were thinking by funding the crab study,
32 they would be looking at a different species
33 and spread the study out geographically.
34 The two studies to choose between isn't a
35 lot.

36 MS. TRUMBLE: Robert, did you
37 have a comment?

38 MR. STOVALL: King crab, there is
39 a push within our office to go ahead and

1 align the state bag limit with the Federal
bag limit. The Federal bag limit presently
2 is six; the State is three; and a proposal
will go in during the proposal cycle to
3 align that to making the Federal season
three also.

4 So, the information from this
study may be useful on either allowing that
5 to continue or maybe changing it.

6 So that's another reason why you
might want to have king crab study numbers,
distribution.

7
MS. TRUMBLE: AI?

8
MR. CRATTY: I'd like to say
9 something on that, Robert. People that live
in the villages, I don't think there should
10 be a limit on how many crab they should eat.
They've been traditionally eating them for
11 years.

12 MR. LUKIN: They were there
plentiful for years, until the commercial
harvest started. Now they're gone. That's
13 not our fault that's happened.

14 MR. SQUARTSOFF: I have one other
thing. I think maybe by doing this project
15 here, it could lead on to doing projects in
other areas, study in other areas, such as
16 Alitak Bay. That's refuge all around there
too.

17
MR. FRIED: If you have some
18 recommendations as to maybe ways the study
might be modified, those would be valuable
19 too.

20 MR. SQUARTSOFF: People talk in
areas and sounds to me like the king crab
21 are coming back in other areas and I don't
know if that has to do with the sea otter
22 decline or not, but king crab are starting
to come back, with the cod decline and the
23 predators. That's just local knowledge from
people.

24
MR. FRIED: If the predators'
25 populations are declining, the conditions
are getting better.

1 MR. SQUARTSOFF: We're going to
2 fund doing a study on something that's in
3 the process of starting to recur. I don't
know --

4 MR. FRIED: I mean, it's also up
5 to the council. You can fund other studies.
6 You can decide to fund the study on Thin
Point Lake. It's up to the council as to
what they want to recommend.

7 MR. SQUARTSOFF: We can choose
8 between other projects.

9 MR. FRIED: You can use that
10 money to fund a harvest-monitoring study or
TEK study or some other study that's on the
books.

11 MS. TRUMBLE: I guess, in looking
12 at this process, at this point, these are
13 what are being recommended for approval; is
that correct?

14 MR. FRIED: Right. Right. The
15 technical review committee goes through all
the investigation plans, and tries to figure
16 out which ones are more strategically
important. They -- do they speak to issues
17 that have been brought forward by councils
or local residents or agencies. Like I said
18 before, are they designed so that it looks
like there can be some success in collecting
19 information that they're trying to collect.
Is it going to be useful for managing
20 subsistence fisheries? The investigators
have enough experience to do this. Have
21 they done this before? Have they never done
it? Can they administer this sort of thing
22 and be successful? And also, you know, is
there any partnership capacity built in
23 there? That was one of the problems with
the crab study when it came before the
24 committee council last year, that there
wasn't any capacity-building in it.
25 Investigators here have tried to do that by
involving a local high school and a
university to be part of the study. They've
tried, you know, to do that.

1 Other studies, you know have --
2 some studies are actually operated by local
3 organizations, primary conductor of a study.
4 They might have a partner with an agency.
5 Some of them have quite a bit of money for
6 hiring local residents to do the study.
7 There's a difference. But what we're trying
8 to do is make sure that all of these
9 studies, you know, result in partnerships
10 and result in information being imparted to
11 local communities so that they can have an
12 active role in managing the studies. It's a
13 pretty important study.

14 MS. TRUMBLE: Maybe just a
15 comment in regard to the Thin Point one.
16 It's my understanding -- Thin Point had a
17 weir, didn't they?

18 MR. FRIED: I think they did.
19 Fish & Game had a weir.

20 MR. GUNDERSON: State had one.

21 MS. TRUMBLE: They're doing the
22 one in Mortensens. I hear a lot of concern,
23 or the statement, "Every time you put a weir
24 somewhere, you don't get the fish back; you
25 start losing the fish." I think people are
26 kind of curious to see what happens since
27 that weir is on Mortensens now because they
28 maintain that's what has happened to Thin
29 Point. That leaves Thin Point as it is now.

30 MR. FRIED: If the weir is not
31 operating properly and the fish are not
32 passed within a reasonable period of time,
33 you would stress fish. If you let people
34 fish below the weir, a lot of these weirs
35 have focused on the Yukon/Kuskokwim area.
36 They funded studies, I think, in 2000, to
37 take villages around to the weir sites to
38 have them see how the weirs are operated to
39 see if their knowledge of how this is really
40 going -- really if it's now with the way
41 weirs are done. That is a real concern, and
42 the Yukon/Kuskokwim people feel a little bit
43 better about weirs having seen some of the
44 newer weirs. The floating weirs that kind
45 of bend down when the turns become too great

1 and some other ways of doing things.

Yeah, that has been a concern.

2 But, like I said, I know the technical
review committee has said we've already
3 funded something in that area.

4 MS. TRUMBLE: Based on Kodiak,
what do you want to do here with this one?
5 Vince?

6 MR. TUTIAKOFF: It sounds like
recommendations from this council should be
7 made -- and these are recommended for
funding only; and, of course, the council is
8 having objections to what I'm hearing, in
009 to being funded and we have
9 recommendations for 003 to be funded. It's
under recommendations not to be funded.

10 What I'm discussing here with the
other members is that maybe we ought to
11 consider making it a point that we support
recommendations '02/'03 for funding from
12 this council, and we do not support 09 --
009 as what we recommended for funding, we
13 do not support it.

And take that to the main board
14 and say this is what the council discussed
and I know that the committee that did the
15 evaluation to get to this point was
asking the regional advisory council to make
16 their recommendation based on what they've
proposed. I think that's where we are. I
17 hear the discussions here; and based on what
you're saying, we can still make a
18 recommendation not to support it to the
council.

19
MR. FRIED: This is just a
20 recommendation to the technical review
committee.

21 Now it's your turn to look at
that.

22
MR. TUTIAKOFF: We've got an
23 objection to the red king crab study being
done in the area and support 003, which is
24 the study on the Kodiak -- for conditional
use --

25
MS. TRUMBLE: 033.

1 MR. TUTIAKOFF: We should do
2 that. That has more benefit to the village
3 concerns than the issue of supporting the
4 red king crab study for --

MR. FRIED: If that's what the
council decides, that's fine.

5 MR. TUTIAKOFF: I'd like to find
6 out what the council members are
7 recommending. Is that what the council is
8 thinking?

MS. TRUMBLE: Speridon?

9 MR. SIMEONOFF: I agree that we
10 would recommend 033; but, as you said
11 earlier, the department doesn't fund this
12 type of program. We have to find which
13 department, which agency would fund this
14 program and we recommend that they do it,
15 even though they say they don't.

MR. SQUARTSOFF: This a different
program.

MR. TUTIAKOFF: To do a study.

MR. SIMEONOFF: Isn't that the
feasibility study?

MS. TRUMBLE: One of the things
under 02-033 that can be used under this is
to determine whether or not there are any
red salmon in that lake that he wanted them
looking at as part of that --

MR. TUTIAKOFF: That would get
that done?

MS. TRUMBLE: Yeah.

MR. TUTIAKOFF: Not actually
putting fish in the lake, get a study done.
There was a history of red salmon in the Old
Harbor area. I'm sure there was prior to
the tidal wave in the 1900s, wiped out three
quarters of Kodiak, that end of it, that
study can be -- can show that there is a
history there. Then we can put them back in

1 there.

2 We have the same problem in the
Aleutians.

3 MS. TRUMBLE: What is the process
now, at this point? If we -- the council
4 makes a motion to change the recommendation,
what is the next step? This goes back?
5 What is the time frame?

6 MR. FRIED: Basically, all of
this information will go back to the Federal
7 Subsistence Board when they meet in
December, and they'll look at the
8 recommendations from the technical review
committee, the recommendations from the
9 councils, any sort of public input that is
received, and the Board will make a decision
10 on which ones to select for funding. We'll
weigh all that information. The more
11 information you can provide as to why you
don't want to fund one and want to fund
12 another would help the Board make their
decision.

13 MS. TRUMBLE: One of the other
14 things on this issue too, I think -- and I
agree with Vince and Pete, is looking at
15 some of the public testimony that we've
taken and I know Pat has been having some
16 problems getting public testimony from
people in regard to developing C and T
17 because -- we have the same thing in our
region -- people don't technically want
18 people to know that they're taking or
harvesting something for subsistence because
19 maybe they're doing it without permits, and
this can fall in under this too.

20 Motion?
21 Any other discussion?

22 MR. TUTIAKOFF: I would move to
recommend to the Federal Subsistence Board
the recommendations for 02-032 to 02-033,
23 and 02-009 that we support for funding,
those -- 02-03 and that we not support 009.
24 Did we get it right?

25 MS. TRUMBLE: Yeah. Is there a
second?

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

MR. GUNDERSON: I'll second.

MS. TRUMBLE: Second by Paul
Gunderson.
Discussion?

MR. TUTIAKOFF: As he mentioned,
we'd have to maybe do some documentation why
we do not support 009; and I think
justification that I've heard is that this
money can better be suited to utilize for
more of the subsistence users which are the
village people versus supporting watching
king crab move around the bottom of Womens
Bay, which has no -- doesn't fill their
stomachs, whereas this other project will in
the end.

MR. SQUARTSOFF: I -- now, if we
had Kodiak Island on here for this king crab
research, then I'd fully support the
funding, not just one small geographic area
of Womens Bay.

MR. TUTIAKOFF: Question.

MS. TRUMBLE: All in favor
signify by saying "aye."

COUNCIL MEMBERS: Aye.

MS. TRUMBLE: Oppose, same sign.
Motion carried. We can get a
letter in regard to this discussion to the
board.
Thank you.

MR. FRIED: Okay. There's some
interregional studies that you probably
should take a look at, and those are on page
50.

There are basically five of them
there on page 51 on the table. Three of
them are trends -- I know councils in
general have had varying feelings about, you
know, the use of some of these interregional
studies. Basically, these are studies that
either have a statewide focus or they span
different geographic regions.

1 The ones that were here for
2 the -- and similar to the other ones, there
3 is a description of these, and those begin
4 on page 56.

5 The technical review committee
6 picked three of these that they felt were
7 worthy of funding. There were two stock
8 status ones and one harvest monitoring-type
9 study.

10 The two stock status ones, one is
11 02-025, which is calling for development of
12 a general method for calculation of
13 sustainable subsistence harvest. Actually
14 what that gets at -- the title isn't real
15 wonderful. It was proposed by the
16 investigators from the University of
17 Washington and the University of Alaska.
18 This is in response to the way in which the
19 State now documents state escapement. The
20 State uses maximum sustained yield. That's
21 what they use as a target to manage mostly
22 commercial fisheries, but also other
23 fisheries.

24 For a people -- people have been
25 saying that's fine for commercial fisheries,
26 but subsistence fisheries don't really fit
27 in there. In other words, okay, it targets
28 usually a range and they try to open and
29 close fisheries so the escapements fall
30 within a range. What happens when you're
31 not going to make the escapement quota, you
32 close down the commercial fisheries, the
33 sport fisheries are closed. How worried do
34 you have to be before you start worrying
35 about closing down subsistence fisheries.
36 There isn't a real good formal method of
37 doing that. These investigators would like
38 to take a look at developing technique and
39 some protocols and some recommendations,
40 some models to figure out just how low can
41 an escapement get and still support the
42 level of need by subsistence users, and
43 that's what this would do. And what they're
44 suggesting to do is put together a model
45 that can be run on a computer using some of
46 the information that they've already
47 collected on some fish, take a few test
48 cases of subsistence fisheries, and those
49 are sort of up in the air right now, but
50 there's been some suggestions that they

1 might want to take a look at some chum
2 stock -- they were suggesting working on
3 sockeye mostly. The technical review
4 committee said, "That's fine. I think we
5 need to look at chums, kings, and other
6 fisheries that are important for subsistence
7 use."

8 I think they were talking about
9 getting back to basically the people in
10 different areas to see -- get their views
11 about subsistence fisheries management.
12 They can also include that somehow in their
13 models and then hold workshops, and show
14 people the model and how it's used and what
15 it's pointing towards to see whether or not
16 it's going in the right direction so people
17 understand what's being done and hopefully
18 if it's -- if it's -- provide some useful
19 information, it would be used by the
20 agencies to start managing fisheries at this
21 point. They actually had besides the people
22 at the university, a representative from the
23 Federal and State agency to help with this
24 process also.

25 That's what this study would do.

MR. GUNDERSON: There's been a
big push by the Board of Fisheries here over
the last couple of years to get the State to
kick loose of some funding to do these
studies because they're just taking shots in
the dark as to what the sustainable yield
and recurring response and genetics and
stuff. They just can't seem to come up with
the money for it, so this would be -- you
guys are working pretty close together now
on all these developments anyway, so....

MR. FRIED: I mean, the
investigators proposing this are basically,
probably one or two of the top people in the
field for salmon quantitative fish stock
analysis. One is Ray Hilborn from the
University of Washington. He's written
textbooks. He's been up in the state
helping out in the state, some of the state
workshops. The other is Milo Atkinson. I
think he lived in Bristol Bay. He's a
professor at the University of Alaska down
in Juneau. They do look at real -- they're

1 not just pie in the sky out in the ozone
 2 academics. They're looking at real-life
 3 application of the work they've done. Ray
 4 has done workshops throughout the world with
 5 fishermen and other work groups throughout
 6 the world. As far as the experience of the
 7 investigators, I think there's no problem
 8 with them being able to do work of this
 9 sort. It's just a matter of whether or not
 10 councils feel this is the top priority.
 11 Obviously, there's five studies here.
 12 There's not enough money to fund all five.
 13 That's one of them. The other
 14 one is to develop a shared YK fisheries
 15 database, which really doesn't affect this
 16 council. Basically, what this would do is
 17 basically finish up the work they started in
 18 the year 2000 by the Department of Fish &
 19 Game to collect a bunch of -- to collect an
 20 inventory and put in a usable format a lot
 21 of the escapement data and biological data
 22 that they have in the -- for the salmon in
 23 the Arctic and Kuskokwim area, to finish a
 24 study.
 25 The other study that was asked
 for by the technical review committee has to
 do with release mortalities of sport-caught
 fish. This is western interior Alaska. It
 doesn't affect this area directly, but
 there's a lot of concern in a lot of areas
 in the state about the mortality of fish
 that are caught and released in sport
 fisheries. And there's been some proposals
 that are put in for funding that haven't
 been funded to do this, and the feeling was
 that maybe it would be better to get a
 working group together like they did for
 harvest assessment and like they're doing
 for database management to take a look at
 compiling all the information that they can
 find on this problem, see which of it
 appears to be applicable to Alaskan
 fisheries, and that would be done the first
 year, and get this information to a working
 group and they would sit down and decide
 whether or not the information is sufficient
 to finally say that "No, there's no problem
 with catch and release fish. Everything is
 fine"; or "Yes, there could be a problem.
 Here's the type of studies we need, and

1 here's what we need to do them." It would
2 just be an effort to focus on catch and
3 release mortalities on sport-caught fish.
4 Those are the three studies for the
5 interregional. This one was rated as a
6 lower priority by the technical review
7 committee. Whether or not you agree with
8 that is a different story.

9 Then there's two harvest
10 monitoring studies. This is 043, called
11 Alaska Subsistence Fisheries database GIS
12 integration. And what this would do would
13 be to provide money to the Department of
14 Fish & Game, take the subsistence
15 information database and combine it with the
16 State's data on anadromous fish streams, you
17 would have a database that would link the
18 subsistence with specific anadromous streams
19 into one database that you could query and
20 ask questions about. That would be a
21 statewide effort which would affect all the
22 information that the subsistence division
23 has.

24 The other one would almost affect
25 this area, not quite. It's called the
subsistence harvest timing project, and it
would look at Bristol Bay, Cook inlet,
Kuskokwim. And this was a request also from
the State of Alaska division of subsistence
to automate the way they pull data out of a
database so they can do timing curves. I
don't know if anybody is familiar with
timing curves. They're used quite a bit in
commercial fisheries management. You take
the run. You know what proportion on
average you get every day. You can build a
curve, and you can do the same thing,
harvest. On this date we usually expect to
see 10 percent of the run, 50 percent of the
run; so you can sort of get an idea, is the
run going to be as big as we think it's
going to be, maybe smaller, is it going to
be late. What they do sometimes is look at
subsistence harvest just to get a feel, are
needs being met. Their problem is every
time they have to do this, they have to
manually pull the data, pull it out, draw
the graphs. They wanted a program to do
that and pull the information to do that.

1 MS. TRUMBLE: 02-047, I'm glad it
2 was not recommended for funding. They
3 inadvertently left both of our regions out
4 of it.

5 MR. FRIED: They wanted to start
6 with these regions. Their idea was once
7 they got done with these regions --

8 MS. TRUMBLE: We're so tied into
9 all of this. It doesn't make sense.

10 MR. FRIED: It doesn't. Those in
11 a nutshell are the interregional proposals.
12 I can answer any other questions about them
13 if you want. It would be -- the main thing
14 would be the council would need to decide,
15 is the recommendation okay. They have a
16 different recommendation, how you want to
17 handle this.

18 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Were you looking
19 for our recommendation of support or not
20 support for each one of these?

21 MR. FRIED: Or you can say you
22 don't support any. Or you can be neutral
23 and not say anything. We've had -- last
24 February we had one council say, "I'd rather
25 take some of this money and use it for our
26 region, to support some more studies." So,
27 any recommendations or advice you want to
28 give to the subsistence board on these
29 studies is, I guess, what we're looking for
30 at this point.

Vince?

31 MR. TUTIAKOFF: I don't know how
32 to approach this, but 02-025 I look at as a
33 proposal to wean Alaska Natives off
34 subsistence. That's basically what this
35 proposal will end up doing. Not now, but in
36 five to ten years. It's kind of a study
37 here that you're doing is what is the very
38 minimum that we could get by with as a
39 subsistence user before we're no longer
40 here? I find it kind of offensive that you
41 want to study subsistence minimum that we
42 could survive on.

If it gets to that point, the

1 very last users are the subsistence users.
And we talked about we're going to shut down
2 commercial and possible sports fishing and
to what limit -- when are you going to shut
3 down subsistence? That's what this proposal
is saying to me.

4 And these other proposals are
coming from the State of Alaska, Department
5 of Fish & Game and I'm sure that most of
these proposals are being driven by the MOA
6 between the fish and wildlife and the State
of Alaska. I never did support that
7 fisheries MOA, in my opinion. We did not
have enough time to really address the
8 issue. It was like a three-month period.
They formed a commission. They formed a
9 body of people, selective people that would
support the Department of Fish & Game and
10 their efforts to have the Federal
Subsistence Board adopt all the fishing
11 regulations in the State of Alaska without
any discussion by the people. This just
12 happened like in a three-month period.

I don't support any of these
13 inter-council programs. They may sound good
and everything, but I think the end product
14 here we're looking at is it's not going to
support our efforts to have a continued
15 subsistence lifestyle. There are some other
efforts by the State, and you mentioned two
16 very reputable people. I don't have
anything against them, but they are the
17 people that supported the State of Alaska in
the fight against the subsistence use. Now
18 we're asking them to work for us under this
program.

19 So, I'm, like, kind of sitting
here going, "What's going on here?"

20 If it come to also a vote, I'm
not going to support either one of these
21 three proposals for funding. That's just my
feeling. I think there's people out in the
22 villages that if they had a chance to assess
these programs would not even be
23 participants.

24 MR. LUKIN: The question about a
few meetings, about that area in the red
25 salmon in the Old Harbor area, the problem
is there is no fish. The problem is we want

1 fish in this area. I mean, what's it take?
How many years does it take to study that
2 there's no fish coming to that area? It's
senseless. You got three years. I look at
3 all these proposals, year one, two, three.
That's so many thousands of dollars for
4 these years. What's that doing to benefit
these guys in the area? You got three years
5 that they got no fish. I mean, as far as
I'm concerned, we need to take this in our
6 own hands. Find the cost of what it's going
to cost to do it ourselves and do it.

7
MS. TRUMBLE: I'm not sure. I
8 just was talking to Paul a little bit.

Go back to this 02-025, I guess I
9 understand what Vince is saying and what,
Ivan, you're saying. But I also looked at
10 this in a different light, and I guess just
maybe being a lot involved with the C and T
11 process, getting a good sense of the
different regions and how they're managing
12 the subsistence, looking at some of these
river systems only being allowed to be
13 utilized by subsistence users, and I
guess -- and also having weekly reports on
14 what has been happening on the YK, these
river systems and how they're monitored and
15 jointly worked together to try to come up
with some sort of system to do what they've
16 been able to do. In my mind, I think it's
been a positive effort, and it seems to be
17 something that's working.

I look at this in a sense of them
18 being able to develop or establish quotas on
subsistence, I think in a little more
19 accurate manner.

Correct me if I'm wrong when I'm
20 saying this. I mean, is that part of what
this 02-025 would do?

21
MR. FRIED: I don't think they're
22 looking at quotas or necessarily looking at
limiting subsistence harvests. I think what
23 they're looking at is the fact that there
needs to be a different way of looking at
24 subsistence fisheries and managing
subsistence fisheries than there is on other
25 fisheries, and that right now all the work
and all the -- all the analyses are being

1 done and they're focusing on managing salmon
fisheries for commercial uses, basically.

2 And I think this study was an
3 attempt, if it goes anywhere, would be an
4 attempt to take a look at just, What are the
5 managing objectives for subsistence
6 fisheries; and, you know, how do we meet
7 these? What sort of escapement goals do you
need for these? It would be different from
the escapement goals than the objectives,
like the commercial fisheries. I think
that's what they were interested in looking
at.

8 MR. GUNDERSON: How successful
9 have they been in getting the tallies up
10 from a year-to-year basis by the subsistence
user from the bigger river systems? I know
they were having a lot of problems before.

11 MR. FRIED: There's still a big
12 effort to do that. It's part of -- starting
13 in 2000, this program spent quite a bit of
14 money on the working group to look at
15 subsistence harvest methods, you know,
16 statewide, and they put out that report that
17 had the protocols; and now they're being
18 funded -- I guess that there's that other
19 handout that you might want to take a look
20 at. That has a real quick summary going on
21 with 2000 and 2001, the studies that were
22 funded, page 3. Statewide subsistence
23 harvest -- monitoring strategy which is the
24 report -- they had the intertribal
25 commission, Alaska Department of Fish and
Game, Division of Subsistence, there were
working groups held, a bunch of
teleconferences, and then they put this
report out that indicated what sort of
information you needed to monitor harvests
and some recommendations and protocols.

They also recommended -- there
were further studies that needed to be done.
Actually, I think both of those were funded
in 2001.

One was -- let's see the numbers.

It was on page 11 of the handout,
and on page 10 there's one that -- validity
and reliability and fisheries harvest
assessment, and the other was the

1 implementation of the statewide fisheries
harvest strategy.

2 And the implementation was
3 actually to go through every single region
4 and sit down with people and develop a plan
5 to monitor harvests. In some areas they do
6 it very well, and in some areas it's really
kind of hit and miss. They were trying to
standardize it and make sure it was done the
same way and the right way in all these
areas.

7 This other one on page 10 was
8 actually to take a look in-depth at a few
9 areas that had known problems to see what
10 was going on, how to fix them.

11 So, this is kind of an ongoing
12 issue and it has been quite a bit of money
that has been spent, is being spent just to
get the best harvest information that can be
obtained, because that's pretty important
for being able to properly manage the
subsistence fishery or any fishery.

13 MR. SQUARTSOFF: I just have a
comment, Della.

14 What I'm seeing here from this
15 stuff -- I've been going to quite a few
16 meetings and stuff too -- all we're doing
17 with this stuff is funding Alaska Department
of Fish & Game projects to continue stuff
18 that they've been studying for years.
Almost all of these are division of
commercial fisheries Alaska Department of
Fish & Game. Most of these projects are
going to Alaska Department of Fish & Game.

19 MR. FRIED: Most of the money --
20 I know part of this program, most of the
21 money is to go to State and local
organizations, and not very much to the
Federal organizations. That was part of it.

22 MR. SQUARTSOFF: What I'm saying
23 is the State budgets are getting cut; now
they're getting money from these projects.

24 MR. FRIED: It's not supposed to
25 be funding projects that are still going to
be funded by the State.

1 MR. SQUARTSOFF: They're starting
2 them over on the subsistence survey.

3 MR. TUTIAKOFF: They just changed
4 the title. They said this is a new program.

5 MR. SQUARTSOFF: For the same
6 stuff. They're surveying the same thing.

7 MR. FRIED: They have to survey
8 the same fisheries. Hopefully, they're
9 improving the way they're doing it. That's
10 part of it.

11 MR. SQUARTSOFF: I just --

12 MR. FRIED: I know. We're trying
13 to make sure that's not being done.

14 MR. SQUARTSOFF: With the State
15 budgets being cut so low, they don't have
16 anymore funding. They're getting it from
17 this.

18 MS. TRUMBLE: Were there any
19 studies or proposals for interregional that
20 addressed pollution or chemicals in the
21 systems?

22 MR. FRIED: There have been in
23 the past. But the Board has said that the
24 program wouldn't be funding those sort of
25 studies. So they had been referring people
26 to other programs. U.S. Fish and Wildlife
27 is doing some studies in Yukon and
28 Kuskokwim. I think it's this year. I don't
29 know if they're doing it next year, to take
30 a look at contaminants in fish. So this is
31 just one of those other types of study that,
32 you know, the Board decided they wanted to
33 see funding go towards. There's a lot of
34 interest up in Arctic on this problem too.

35 MS. TRUMBLE: Did they ever
36 determine what was the problem with the fish
37 that were glowing in the dark up there?

38 MR. FRIED: I heard about that.
39 It sounds like it could be bacterial
40 infection. That can do that. There is some

1 bacteria that will glow.
I know they're doing disease
2 studies. They spent some money on that, to
look -- on the Yukon, Ichthyophonus, the
3 fungal infection and that sort of thing.

4 MS. TRUMBLE: It's too bad. I
think contaminants would have been a good
5 study. I've heard it brought up by other
regions. Anytime we have a group statewide
6 together, that issue keeps coming up.

7 MR. FRIED: I think it's
ecological services within fish and wildlife
8 does studies like that. Sometimes the State
DEC and Federal EPA will fund studies like
9 that. But I guess if you feel real
strongly, that decision by the Board, I
10 suppose you can draft a letter and ask them
to reconsider that and provide reasons why
11 you think they should fund contaminant
studies.

12 Like I say, they're focused on
what can be used to make fisheries
13 management decisions. Not that that isn't
part of the mix.

14 MS. TRUMBLE: Any other council
15 discussion?
Recommendation?

16 MR. GUNDERSON: I see some -- on
17 parts or pieces of all this on the
calculation of sustainable subsistence to be
18 a good tool that they need to -- and a
number of these issues have been brought up
19 and fights have been with the Board of
Fisheries over a number of years. They do
20 not have the data, and that's why they
calculate some of the numbers that they do.

21 You know, it could come full
circle and bite you right in the butt too.
22 So, you know, we don't really know at this
point what's going to happen with it.

23 MS. TRUMBLE: That may work to
24 our benefit too.
Vince?

25 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Huh?

1

MS. TRUMBLE: AI?

2

MR. TUTIAKOFF: I guess 025 is a project -- final product of computer software, and protocol would -- would greatly enhance the abilities of fishery management agencies, which is Department of Fish & Game to evaluate and get an alternative subsistence harvesting regime. I mean, what they're looking at is restructuring the way they think about subsistence. That's basically what the fellow said here.

8

I have concerns about the wording. Maybe it's just the wording that's bothering me. I think it's a good program like Paul mentioned. It's something that's needed, possibly. But I think there's going to be people out there, the subsistence users that are going to hear about this in the future and say, "Why are they studying to find a way to get rid of subsistence?" That's the way they're going to evaluate. That's the way I evaluate.

On the shared fishery database, it's the same thing. We're paying for a different type of system, and they want to come out with the accomplishments of 025 under that study. They're following up, it sounds like.

I have some concerns the same as Pete does that we're funding the State of Alaska to get this project -- these projects done. But if that's what we have to do to get the information in this day and age when we go to court to fight for our uses and our lifestyle, this may be a tool we can use. I don't know.

But then again, it could be something we're funding to knock us back down on the ground again. I don't know.

I'd recommend we don't take a position on 025 and 02 -- 0 -- what's the other one, 069? And there was three of them, right?

24

MR. FRIED: 043, also.

25

MR. TUTIAKOFF: 043?

1 MR. FRIED: Yeah.

2 MR. TUTIAKOFF: That's probably
3 part 3 of 025, you know.

4 MS. TRUMBLE: I think if you look
5 on the bottom of page 57 on partnerships,
6 collaboration, and consultation, if you go
7 to the second sentence: "Subsistence user
8 groups would have a key role in developing
9 subsistence fishery management objectives
10 and evaluating resulting projects.
11 Consultations have already taken place with
12 Bristol Bay Science Center, Aleutians East
13 Borough, Chignik Regional Aquaculture
14 Association, and Alaska Department of Fish
15 and Game and further consultations would
16 occur with other regional organizations and
17 Federal fisheries management agencies."

18 MR. TUTIAKOFF: If we can hold
19 them to that word, yeah, like every other
20 study they do. We authorize it in the
21 years -- and they've, in the years past,
22 have used it against the village tribes,
23 community. They come in a community to do a
24 study, "It's going to be good for you." Two
25 years later, whatever we're doing in that
particular river can no longer happen in the
law. They develop a law for that. It's
happened in our communities in the past.
We've got research people that come in and
ask questions. Two years later they got a
law on the books saying we can't do that
anymore.

19 MS. TRUMBLE: One of the problems
20 with Kodiak/Aleutians is people don't tell
21 anybody nothing. They haven't for years.
22 The same sense, it's bit us in the butt too.
23 When we're making determinations on C and T
24 and things, there is nothing on record
25 anywhere for our regions.
So, it's a two-way street here,
and I think if it's monitored closely --
Paul, do you have something to
say?

25 MR. GUNDERSON: Going through a
proposal -- I don't know how to say this.

1 There's checks and balances on it. If they
2 do change it, if we got a chance to do
3 something about it before it's acted into
4 law or things like that. So I think we do
5 have some tools to monitor this whole
6 operation.

7 MR. FRIED: I think if you'd look
8 at the justification which include the
9 reviewers' comments, the last paragraph, I
10 think they had some of the same concerns
11 about the partnership. That was one of the
12 concerns they had with the original
13 proposal. And this one is improved, but it
14 still needs to go further.

15 So....
16 I think, all I can say, this
17 program is quite a bit different from most
18 other programs because it does seek
19 partnerships, and that's part of the -- part
20 of the basis for funding any of these
21 things. If these studies don't have that
22 and don't have the capacity-building
23 component in there, it probably shouldn't be
24 funded. So....

25 That's all I can say.

 MS. TRUMBLE: Vince?

 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Just to get this
thing off, people can vote how they feel.
To get a motion on the floor. 025, 069,
043 -- 043. I move that we would support
their recommendations for funding it.
Council members vote however they want.
I'll ask for roll call.

 MR. SQUARTSOFF: What was that
now, for funding them?

 MR. TUTIAKOFF: That we -- move
the recommendations of 025, 069, 043 for
funding, and that is their recommended
funding proposals. Just to get it off.

 MS. TRUMBLE: Take it to a vote.

 MS. TRUMBLE: I hear a second to
Vince's motion.

 MR. GUNDERSON: I'll second.

1 MS. TRUMBLE: Seconded by Paul
Gunderson.

2 Roll call, please.
Mr. Secretary?

3 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Vince

4 Tutiakoff? Start with Vince.

5 MR. TUTIAKOFF: No.

6 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Al?

7 MR. CRATTY: No.

8 MR. SQUARTSOFF: I'm voting
"yes."
Della?

9 MS. TRUMBLE: Yes.

10 MR. GUNDERSON: Yes.

11 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Paul?

12 MR. GUNDERSON: Yes.

13 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Speridon?

14 MR. SIMEONOFF: Yes.

15 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Ivan?

16 MR. LUKIN: Yes.

17 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Five "yes" and
18 two "no."

19 MS. TRUMBLE: Three absent.

20 MR. TUTIAKOFF: You relay to the
Board my concerns, not necessarily we don't
want that program, but the way it's been
21 presented is what concerns me.

22 MS. TRUMBLE: We'll outline the
concerns, the areas of concern.

23 MR. TUTIAKOFF: I vote for a
24 recess for lunch.

25 MS. TRUMBLE: Recess for lunch.
We're going to come back at 1:00 o'clock.

1 Everybody, we'll see you at 1:00.

2 (Lunch break.)
3 (Richard Zacharof and John Foster
4 are present in the meeting room.)

4 MS. TRUMBLE: I guess we can call
5 this meeting back to order. Richard was
6 here, but he had to run down to the clinic
7 for an appointment. He'll be back. John is
8 here now.

9 The next thing on our agenda is
10 customary and trade and this is with Richard
11 and Carl.

12 MR. UBERUAGA: Good afternoon,
13 Madam Chairman, members of the council. My
14 name is Richard Uberuaga. I'm a fisheries
15 biologist assigned to analyze fisheries
16 regulations proposals for four areas in the
17 state: North Slope, Northwest Arctic,
18 Seward Peninsula, and now the
19 Kodiak/Aleutians. I'll be taking Larry
20 Buklis' place. Larry is real busy on other
21 areas of the state.

22 I'd like you to refer to Tab J in
23 your booklet. There is a briefing on --
24 titled "Custom Area Trade." You'll find a
25 written briefing in draft regulatory
26 language, and a schedule of events as a
27 customary trade task force work toward a
28 final rule. My purpose here today is to
29 give you a briefing today on the customary
30 trade task force activities in the last few
31 months, to give you an idea where they're at
32 and how we're moving forward to making a
33 final rule.

34 I'm going to cover four areas
35 briefly. The issue of customary trade and
36 why we're talking about it; the draft
37 regulatory proposed language, a timeline or
38 schedule of events we are working towards,
39 and the importance of your council's input
40 into this process.

41 After I'm done speaking on the
42 customary trade issue, Carl Jack will talk
43 to you about the tribal consultation process
44 that's occurring in the state.

45 First, we need to establish
46 what's meant in regulatory terms when we
47 discuss customary trade. Customary trade

1 refers to the cash sales of
2 subsistence-harvested fish. I need to
3 mention right now that this draft regulatory
4 language that you have only deals with the
5 cash sale of fish, and not wildlife species.

6 So, in recognizing that the
7 regulations -- bartering is treated
8 separately. We're not talking about
9 bartering or exchanging fish for other goods
10 and services. We're just talking about cash
11 sales of fish.

12 Under the current Federal
13 regulations, customary trade is recognized.
14 However, the language that's used is not
15 very specific, and it's not specific enough
16 to define allowable levels.

17 Customary trade is clearly
18 recognized for cash sales of subsistence
19 fish as long as the transaction does not
20 constitute a significant commercial
21 enterprise.

22 However, a significant commercial
23 enterprise is not defined in any regulations
24 or statute, therefore, there's a great deal
25 of confusion on what is a significant
commercial enterprise.

As written, this regulation is
un- enforceable and our law enforcement
within Fish & Wildlife has had some problems
with enforcement of fish being sold --
subsistence fish being sold on the
commercial market.

The current language could invite
further abuse of subsistence-harvested fish;
and, therefore, if the limits of the cash
exchange aren't defined, then subsistence
users could suffer, along with other users.

That's basically how the Federal
Subsistence Board created this task force of
council members -- primarily council
members, one from each region, to address
this issue and develop some new draft
regulatory language that would clearly
define customary trade.

As you know, Della has been the
representative from the Kodiak/Aleutians
committee or task force, and she's been
present at all the meetings and is very well
informed about the workings of that
committee or task force.

1 I'm sure if you have any
2 questions later on, that she'll be able to
3 help in answering them. She's very active
4 on the task force. I think the last time we
5 met was August 1st and 2nd in Anchorage.

6 In any case, the goal of this
7 task force was to develop some draft
8 regulatory language that would establish --
9 that would define the practices of customary
10 trade and provide some good definitions that
11 were consistent with ANILCA and define
12 limits to cash sales.

13 The task force would like to
14 develop language that's fair, prevents
15 abuses of subsistence-caught fish, and that
16 does not limit the trade between qualified
17 rural users and villages.

18 First, I'd like to go through the
19 draft regulatory language with you and
20 you'll find that on, I believe, page 4.

21 MS. TRUMBLE: Starts on page 3.

22 MR. UBERUAGA: 3? Okay.

23 The first part of this language
24 deals with customary trade between rural
25 residents. And, in summary, the task force
so far has recommended that there are no
limits on cash sales of fish between rural
residents. That's under A-12 there -- or
A-11, excuse me. A-11.

Briefly, on the next section, the
main section is A-12 which deals with cash
sales of rural residents and others,
nonrural residents.

And this language establishes an
annual cap or recommends an annual cap for
the sale of salmon and other fish species,
but it does identify a figure for salmon to
start with.

The task force did not recommend
that monetary caps be placed on other
species at this time, but rather that the
regional councils recommend specific dollar
amounts for particular species, for
hooligan, roe on kelp, and other species.

The next part of the regulations
deals with sale to commercial businesses.

So, what we've got is a timeline
of events that I'd like to briefly go over

1 with you, and then we're going to hear from
2 Carl about the tribal consultation process.

3 And then after that we can go through any
4 questions or concerns, and then start
5 looking for recommendations from your
6 council towards us -- to us so we can carry
7 that forward to the Federal Subsistence
8 Board this winter in the December meeting.

9 So, first, I want to talk about
10 the schedule of events, the first step which
11 is what we're doing right now is reviewing
12 the draft regulatory language that the
13 council or that the task force prepared.

14 You know, it's an extremely
15 important step. It's a real tough
16 assignment to get to where we got. We did
17 recommend a thousand-dollar cap be placed on
18 the sale of salmon between rural residents
19 and others as a starting point for
20 discussion.

21 And we expect a lot more input
22 from tribal entities and councils on this
23 topic.

24 So, by the 1st of November, we
25 hope to have summarized from all of our
councils what comments we've received during
the fall council meetings so we can take
that to the task force and have the task
force review these comments.

And further, we'd take those
comments to the staff committee, the
interagency staff committee and the Federal
Subsistence Board.

I want to note that it's really
important to recognize that this is not your
only opportunity to comment on the customary
trade issue. There will be a lot more time
to comment on it, but we want to hear from
you now, your feelings on this.

So, step two, between November 1
and the 15th of this year the task force is
going to meet and go over your council
comments and preliminary tribal comments
from the tribal governments and the general
public and recommend on how to proceed from
there and how to address those comments.

The next step, prior to the
subsistence board meeting in December,
meeting with the interagency staff will be
to review all the comments, develop

1 recommendations on the draft preamble or the
2 draft introductory language to the
regulations.

3 In December, the Board's going to
4 take up this topic, recognizing the
council's input, and begin to develop a
5 proposed rule for final regulations down the
road.

6 That proposed rule will become
published in the Federal Register after
7 which the public gets a chance to comment
on -- the public being the entire United
8 States, a chance to comment on that proposed
rule. After which the next step will be
9 regional councils, tribal governments, get
their input into the councils. The councils
10 are going to be asked for their
recommendations, of course, again, at the
11 winter meeting in February or March. Those
comments and recommendations on the proposed
rule again go to the Federal Subsistence
Board prior to their May meeting.

12 While this is all going on, the
interagency staff, of course, is going to be
13 reviewing the comments on the rule and
they're going to be making their
14 recommendations taking into account, of
course, the regional councils and public
15 comment and tribal comment, especially.

16 During the May 2002 meeting, the
Board is going to review all comments from
everyone and take a final action after which
17 that final action will be published in the
Federal Register as a final rule. And the
18 attempt is to have that final rule go into
effect for the 2002 fishing season or July
19 2002 fishing season will be underway at that
time.

20 But that is the intent.

21 So, now -- I guess, at this time

22 I'd like to turn it over to Carl Jack who
will talk to you about that very important
tribal consultation process that's going on.
23 And he can give you a real good rundown on
that.

24 Carl?

25 MR. JACK: Thank you, Richard.
Madam Chairman, members of the council.
My name is Carl Jack. I was

1 hired as a Native liaison last December, so
I have not been on very long. I'm still
2 trying to learn how to be a Federal
employee, I guess.

3 What I'm going to be talking
about is different from how the government
4 consults with the public or works through
the advisory committees.

5 I believe during the last meeting
you had the Department of Interior policy on
6 government- to-government relations with
Alaska Native tribes may have been included
7 in your packet, but if not, I do have a copy
here that --

8
9 MR. UBERUAGA: Would anyone like
one?

10 MR. JACK: That's the key
document by which tribal consultation is
11 based on.

12 MR. JENNINGS: Maybe we can get
more copies made.

13
14 MR. TUTIAKOFF: I'll just read it
and pass it on.

15 MR. JACK: On January 19th, 2001,
the Fish and Wildlife Service and the four
16 other Federal agencies that are involved in
Federal management, along with the assistant
17 secretary for the secretary in Alaska,
signed that document. It's called The
18 Alaska Policy on Government-to-Government
Relations with Alaska Native Tribes, and
19 that document from the time it's signed will
guide the office of subsistence management
20 on tribal consultation.

 On this issue of customary trade,
21 the proposed rule will impact all Alaska
Natives, and all members of the tribes. And
22 for that reason, the office of subsistence
management has initiated tribal consultation
23 that was started about three weeks ago. A
copy of the proposed rule, the timetables
24 that are in your packet, was mailed to each
and every one of the 229 tribes; and the
25 comment period for that is from the time it
was mailed and from the time it's received

1 to probably on about -- to October 31, 2001.

2 Now, in preparation for this
3 tribal consultation-- and from the time that
4 I came on board and that period of time, I
5 guess, the customary trade task force really
6 got to start working, we have met with --
7 and provided reports to the Alaska
8 intertribal council. We provided them with
9 the work that was done by the customary
10 trade task force, the minutes of the task
11 force were provided to the AITC; and, based
12 on our meetings a two-phased tribal
13 consultation process was developed.

14 One was to mail the proposed
15 rule, the briefing paper that's in your
16 packet along with the timetable to the
17 tribes; and secondly, if there's any
18 questions by the tribes, there is a
19 provision whereby we would make an effort to
20 meet one on one with the tribal members.

21 Now, considering the short time
22 frame that we have, we will not be able to
23 meet one on one with 229 tribes; but we will
24 make an effort to do that if -- but, you
25 know, the time is short to do one on one,
would probably take probably about a year,
and take a lot of resources to do it. But
we did include that language there.

15 The tribal consultation was
16 initiated mainly because of the unique legal
17 relationships of the Alaska federally
18 recognized tribes with the United States
19 Government.

20 Earlier, Richard mentioned
21 additional comments, opportunities, and one,
22 in particular, is the requirements under the
23 administrative procedures act whereby the
24 proposed rule will -- will be published and
25 the public and the tribes will get that
opportunity to provide additional comments
before the final rule is adopted by the
Federal Subsistence Board.

22 So, in conclusion, the office of
23 subsistence management is committed to
24 consultation with the Alaska federally
25 recognized tribes in accordance with the
executive orders and policies that guide
that -- you know, guide that service. And
that is primarily based on that document.

So, that is where we are, Madam

1 Chairman.

That concludes my presentation.

2

MS. TRUMBLE: Thank you, Carl.

3

Maybe just to give a general overview before we get into discussion.

4

This task force was -- was a lot of work, and it got pretty stressful a number of times. I think we got through it without -- I'm not exactly -- I don't have a word for it. It was an effort; but it was done, I think, in a manner that -- we managed to get all through it.

7

We did learn, given that all the regions were at the table over the period of the meeting that we had, a lot about how the various regions utilize and take subsistence fish, which I think was an eye-opener by itself. A lot of people did not realize that the area, for one, Kodiak/Aleutians, Aleutians area, Kodiak and any of the outlying villages, did not realize that our take of the subsistence fish had been under the guise of the State permit system and what the totals are. They were under the understanding that we took whatever we wanted and there was no regions. That is the case, I think in one region, which is Bristol Bay.

15

Trying to come to some sort of definition that would not only be legal, but I think would be able to -- to take into consideration the concerns of a lot of the regions, but to allow something for the regions that have been utilizing this for a number of years and having to utilize it because they have no means of making -- basically, putting food on their table and in the sense of selling subsistence fish.

20

The concern that I had in going through this process were mainly the limits. You know, we heard limits that started at zero to \$500, all the way to 5,000, all the way up to 15,000. I think if we get into the higher dollar amount, it does open the door to abuse.

24

At our last meeting, we got to the point where we were actually -- it was almost an agreement to leave it to the various councils to come up with a dollar

25

1 figure. I think, in turn, that would have
2 caused a lot more controversy and wouldn't
3 have solved what the intention was of
4 redefining this title.

5 We did eventually agree to come
6 up with a total between 500 and 1500, and we
7 sat amongst ourselves and discussed it and
8 determined that 1,000 is probably a workable
9 figure that maybe we can all agree on.

10 And there are and were concerns
11 from enforcement that that still was going
12 to create a problem, that \$1,000 is too
13 much. And they were at the table with us
14 the whole time.

15 There is also the concerns
16 brought up of what the various people in the
17 communities and villages believe from their
18 perspective of enforcement and the treatment
19 and enforcement given their perspective of
20 what their jobs were to do and how they had
21 to -- it wasn't an easy task at all.

22 I felt comfortable leaving that
23 table that we did actually come up with
24 figures, and my reasoning more so than
25 anything else is that these fish, especially
in the river systems that have problems
right now, there are controls as to how much
is taken because those controls are the
limits of what is allowable for subsistence
fish in these various regions.

But, like I say, it's up for
discussion with the council, and hopefully I
can answer anymore questions as to how we
got to where we did.

MR. SQUARTSOFF: I'll ask you
first.

Was there discussion -- do all
regions have to participate in this?

MS. TRUMBLE: I think -- it's an
overall -- basically, it's overall the
definition is going to be published in the
Federal Register. If for some reason one
region -- and it's written in here -- wants
a higher amount, technically they need to
take that to the Federal Board, and the
Federal Board would have to go through the
whole public process.

1 MR. SQUARTSOFF: I'm leading to,
"What if we don't want no amount?"

2 MR. JENNINGS: That can be a
3 recommendation.

4 MS. TRUMBLE: That can be a
5 recommendation?

6 MR. SQUARTSOFF: I don't know.
I'm just saying that, because I personally
7 can't see putting any monetary selling of
any subsistence fish. That's just my
8 personal feeling. Subsistence is
subsistence. You're selling it --

9 MS. TRUMBLE: It's tough.

10 MR. UBERUAGA: You're saying
zero, then.

11 MR. SQUARTSOFF: On salmon. I'm
only speaking of salmon. Other species,
12 maybe, depending on the situation where it's
at.

13 MS. TRUMBLE: The limits were
14 there, basically, on the limits in salmon.

15 MR. JACK: I was going to point
out, when you look at the proposed rule,
16 it's important to look at the three levels.
One is rural to rural, talking about rural
17 qualified subsistence users to another. In
that category, there's no limit.

18 The second is rural to others,
which could be others like in Anchorage.
19 And there is a limit of 1,000.

20 And the third one, it's just
basically a prohibition to prohibit the
commercial businesses from buying fish.

21 MR. SQUARTSOFF: I understand. I
22 appreciate all the work that everybody's
done. I just personally do not feel that
23 there should be a monetary value put on
subsistence fish or salmon.

24 MR. UBERUAGA: No fish could be
25 sold or any amount could be sold.

1 MR. SQUARTSOFF: My feeling is no
2 salmon for any money.

3 MR. CRATTY: I feel the same way
4 Peter does, but in a different way. I feel
5 there's some people that do need it.
6 There's people in our village that, you
7 know, don't make a living. They have very
8 little to live off. I think it should be
9 there in a way, but not to be taken
10 advantage of.

11 MR. SQUARTSOFF: That's why I was
12 saying "by region." Maybe some areas need
13 it; maybe some don't.

14 MS. TRUMBLE: In the same sense,
15 Pete, when you look at this, I think it also
16 limits to what is a statewide -- what other
17 regions can possibly -- I mean, I just felt
18 really uncomfortable leaving it with an
19 open-door thing by region. You know, I
20 think some regions would want more, and they
21 did want more in the dollar value.

22 But I think it may set some
23 parameters around this whole issue.

24 MR. CRATTY: The income places --

25 MR. SQUARTSOFF: I'm really
concerned about the salmon spawning in
rivers. If they're going to be able to sell
the roe or fish, even if it's to other
Native people in Anchorage or whatever, and
family members are included, it could be a
lot of fish.

MS. TRUMBLE: It can be a lot of
fish, but the amounts are based on what the
allowable take in a certain river system is
set by Fish and Wildlife.

MR. SQUARTSOFF: Yeah, I
understand all that, but maybe everybody is
going to be 100 percent honest. I don't
know.

MS. TRUMBLE: I think they're
going to be able to be enforced at this
point, where technically that was a problem

1 in the past.

2 MR. CRATTY: I feel if there's a
3 need, if there's a set amount on an income,
4 if a person only makes 5 grand a year, let
5 them sell \$1000. I can see people taking
6 advantage of it. You'd run into a problem
7 like Peter is talking about.

8 MS. TRUMBLE: Carl?

9 MR. JACK: As you know, the \$1000
10 is per family member.

11 MR. SQUARTSOFF: You have five
12 family members, it's \$5,000, of course, 10
13 family members, or whatever.

14 MR. JACK: I did state this in
15 Barrow, this is -- this is basically
16 enforcement driven. It's driven by the
17 enforcement section. At one time we could
18 have a staff committee meeting. We were
19 provided with a copy of a page from a
20 catalog, Cabella's, Yukon Salmon Strips.
21 So, the colonel of the enforcement section
22 was to stop selling large quantities of
23 processed salmon to outside interests.

24 MS. TRUMBLE: Or even to a
25 commercial enterprise which has --

MR. JACK: Or to a commercial
enterprise. And the rationale is in the
long run that this can have a detrimental
impact on the subsistence user.

MS. TRUMBLE: There have been
abuses. I agree with the Boards. I think
it needs to be there. I think -- we need to
get there. We've been affected, our area,
because of what's happened. Enforcement
issue is going to help the abuse, I think,
if it -- indeed it is happening to a degree.
We all know that it is. Even though I know
it is, all of us agree that there's a
problem.

And I think it helps resolve
that, at least address the problem where
technically they don't have a means of it
just because the way this law has been

1 written in the past.

Vince, did you have a comment?

2

3 MR. TUTIAKOFF: On the annual, on
4 A-12, that's the only place that it
5 addresses annual. I'm trying to get a
definition of what that means. 1,000 per
family member annual? For one person, once
a year up to \$1,000?

6 MS. TRUMBLE: From urban to
7 rural.

8

9 MR. UBERUAGA: That's my
10 understanding.

11 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Is that for all
12 species or just for one?

13

MR. UBERUAGA: Just for salmon.

14 MR. SQUARTSOFF: You can do trout
15 and herring and cod.

16

17 MR. UBERUAGA: Sheefish and other
18 species, wherever those species are being
19 sold, like sheefish in the northwest Arctic.
20 The regional council would then get together
21 amongst themselves, address what's an
22 appropriate limit in our area to sell
23 sheefish? And they might set \$100. They
24 might set 5,000. That's the council's
25 prerogative to address individual species
similar to Southeast where there is hooligan
being sold. Council there would address the
issue and make recommendations to the Board
on how to deal with it.

19 It gives some power to the
individual councils where there are
individual species other than salmon being
sold.

20

21 MS. TRUMBLE: One of the things,
22 I think, just backing up a little bit too,
23 is putting some sort of dollar value on what
significant commercial enterprise is.

24 There was technically no -- there
25 was nothing there. Technically, it could
have been unlimited the way the current law
is written.

1 MR. TUTIAKOFF: In your process,
2 did you look at the economy of various
3 regions and try to come up with maybe using
 the percentage of the total economy versus a
 dollar figure?

4 MS. TRUMBLE: I think the
5 statement that keeps coming up through the
6 course of this is that subsistence fish is
 technically 2 percent of whatever the -- I
 need the word here.

7 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Escapement
8 levels are.

9 MS. TRUMBLE: So, technically,
10 that always came out. We were talking about
 2 percent.

11 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Who came up with
 that figure?

12 MS. TRUMBLE: Just fact, I think.
13 If you took the totals --

14 MR. UBERUAGA: 2 to 5 percent of
 the total commercial, of all harvest, very
 small portion of it is subsistence fish.

15 I think what you need to keep in
16 mind, in the major rivers of Yukon,
 Kuskokwim, a lot of people are fishermen and
 subsistence users. They're commercial
17 fishermen and subsistence fishermen also.
 They're not mixing those two, because there
18 are laws that address the commercial fishing
 by those people.

19 MR. TUTIAKOFF: 90 percent of the
20 commercial fishermen are also subsistence
 users?

21 MR. UBERUAGA: Exactly.

22 MR. TUTIAKOFF: That was my
23 question. Do you get or does the State have
 any kind of a table that determines, say,
24 the household income for a region and then
 uses that household income for that region
25 to justify some kind of a return on your --
 the subsistence fish?

1 I mean, examples, say it's \$300
2 per household, in the village out here, in
3 the Chain somewhere. It could be like Atka.
4 If we just did a percentage of the
5 Kodiak/Aleutians, and say we will allow up
6 to 30 percent of your total household income
7 a year to be put -- you can go out and do
8 the trade and bartering or whatever, but the
9 actual sale of the salmon could not exceed a
10 percentage of the household income. That
11 seems to be more of an attempt than just
12 putting \$1,000 bounty on subsistence fish.

13 That's what I would say. Is
14 there that kind of methodology utilized?
15 The same where they give out --

16 MS. TRUMBLE: One of the things
17 to think about --

18 MR. TUTIAKOFF: So they get food
19 stamps; they get welfare; they get all these
20 other problems that we're trying to deal
21 with as part of subsistence. And the
22 economy is what's driving this issue.

23 MS. TRUMBLE: Tim?

24 MR. JENNINGS: I wanted to
25 offer -- maybe Pat could help me out with
this, or someone else. It's my
recollection, that the State when they had
the program, subsistence program, attempted
to base subsistence needs on economic
factors like Vince has mentioned. And the
Federal program, we don't have that
factoring in. It's qualified rural
residents; and so far under the Federal
system, there is no economic factoring in
terms of subsistence needs. So, there's a
clear distinction there, that I think is
made.

26 Pat, is that a fair assessment?

27 MS. PETRIVELLI: Well, the early
28 subsistence studies did do a lot of
29 economics, and I think they've gotten away
30 from it. I'm not sure if it's because of
31 legal stuff or otherwise. They've gotten
32 away from it, of economics and subsistence
33 use. It's customary, the idea of direct

1 dependence. C and T is whether it's the
2 customary and traditional use of the
3 resource, and customary trade is one of the
4 recognized uses.

5 MR. JENNINGS: I don't recall the
6 task force ever addressing the economic
7 factor as an issue.

8 MS. TRUMBLE: I think we took
9 into consideration that there are regions up
10 north that basically depend on this as some
11 sort of -- some means of income to provide
12 fuel for -- you know, for their boats or
13 skiffs to go hunting or their snow machines,
14 and to heat their homes. What -- they
15 don't -- other than -- basically as an
16 economic base don't necessarily have
17 anything there to help them provide just for
18 the basic means. And that's what part of
19 this discussion was is how do we know -- we
20 take that into consideration and allow for
21 them to continue, but to also limit what
22 that continuation can be, put some
23 parameters around it.

24 I just lost my chain of thought
25 here. There was one other thing I was going
to mention.

26 We did, in a sense, talk by
27 region to region, you know, how this has --
28 one of the things in our region to look at
29 is we don't necessarily take -- we don't
30 take our fish from any of our Federal
31 waters. In this case, we're looking at
32 Mortensens, Thin Point. These rivers are
33 nothing. Buskin and the Bear, I think are
34 nothing compared to these other river
35 systems.

36 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Right, right.
37 They're so small.

38 MS. TRUMBLE: The fish is down
39 250 fish for subsistence under State
40 guidelines.

41 MR. FOSTER: Why did you go
42 monetary value instead of number of fish? I
43 mean, if you're selling smoke salmon, \$1000
44 for the fish isn't very many fish, but with

1 the price of fish right now, \$1,000 worth of
whole fish could be a lot of fish.
2 Actually, chums are going for a dollar a
fish right now. We could be talking 1000
3 fish.

4 MR. UBERUAGA: My answer would be
that it attempted to address the current
5 regulations and significant commercial
enterprise, just getting a handle on those
6 three words. That's the only answer I have.
You're absolutely right. One fish could be
7 worth a lot of money, or it could be worth
very little, depending on how it's processed
8 and how big it is. Lots of different
factors.

9 MS. TRUMBLE: Technically, rural
10 to rural, region within region, there are no
limits. Once you take it out of a rural
11 area, taking smoked salmon to AFN and
selling it, then you're limited to \$1000.
12

13 MR. TUTIAKOFF: In some cases,
people who do bring out salmon, I understand
the issue of people up north in the river
14 system. It costs them several hundred
dollars just to get to Anchorage and house
15 themselves and hope to make money to go back
home to buy oil. That's the issue they're
16 dealing with.

17 MS. TRUMBLE: 500 to \$1,000 just
because of the cost of living increase at
18 this point. That was raised in there. That
was part of that discussion.
19

20 MR. SQUARTSOFF: I guess one of
the biggest parts of my concern is the
enforcement part of this, make sure there's
21 no abuse.

22 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Who is going to
report they got \$1000 of sold fish.
23

24 MR. CRATTY: I got a question for
Robert. Which streams would be involved in
Kodiak? There wouldn't be very many.
25

MR. STOVALL: It wouldn't be

1 streams, but it could be the area in front
2 of the Buskin River.

3 MR. CRATTY: That's about it,
4 ain't it?

5 MR. STOVALL: Along Afognak
6 Island. And Karluk.

7 MR. CRATTY: That's it.

8 MR. STOVALL: Yeah. Those are
9 pretty substantial areas when you start to
10 think of how much is being harvested.

11 MR. UBERUAGA: Off Afognak.

12 MR. CRATTY: So what rivers are
13 we talking about?

14 MR. SQUARTSOFF: All of them.

15 MS. TRUMBLE: The council is
16 setting -- if someone came in with a
17 proposal for so much fish in so many areas,
18 this council can limit what that fish is.

19 MR. CRATTY: I have questions --
20 excuse me, Della.

21 The rivers that run by Old Harbor
22 off of Federal lands, you guys have no
23 jurisdiction over?

24 MR. STOVALL: Right.

25 MR. CRATTY: How do you have
jurisdiction over the other rivers? I don't
understand.

MR. STOVALL: I don't understand
why we're discussing rivers.

MR. CRATTY: I'm trying to get in
my head to -- where are people going to get
fish off of Federal lands to get fish and
sell them.

MR. STOVALL: It's -- my
understanding is those lands are Federally
submerged tidal waters of Afognak Island, of

1 the Buskin and Womens Bay area and the
2 Karluk River. Now, if you wanted to go
3 inland where some impact would be had, it
4 could be Ayakulik River. It may be the
5 Karluk River if things change
6 jurisdictionwise; it might be the Uganik
7 River; it might be the Spirited. I don't
8 know what kind of fisheries there are in the
9 Spirited. There's the Zachar River, and
10 there's Uyak. There's Dog Salmon. Akulara.
11 Those are all river systems within the
12 Refuge.

13 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Basically,
14 pretty much all of Kodiak refuge -- Maritime
15 Refuge. And Afognak Maritime Refuge, Port
16 Lions.

17 MR. TUTIAKOFF: The
18 recommendation from the committee is what's
19 presented here?

20 MS. TRUMBLE: Uh-huh.
21 You know, we did bring up --
22 Speridon and I brought up numerous times
23 just from the various members of this
24 council, every one of you had their own
25 definition of what that definition should
26 be. That's just diverse just among this
27 council itself. Speridon and I brought up
28 numerous times what your definition of it is
29 that basically subsistence should not
30 have -- is a means of life, not a means of
31 monetary value. And that is, in essence,
32 pretty much the majority of what our council
33 feels, and the people of my region. Because
34 we never had to be dependent on it as a
35 means of providing for our families.

36 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Like other
37 areas?

38 MS. TRUMBLE: Yeah.

39 MR. GUNDERSON: Everybody that's
40 done it, that just provides for their own
41 immediate family. They had never taken any
42 amounts of them, so they could trade or sell
43 or whatever.

1 MR. SIMEONOFF: I've got a
2 question. If the sale of subsistence salmon
3 goes through, a household has a subsistence
4 limit to their household, like say a person
5 gets 25 fish and he's allowed to sell \$1,000
6 of fish -- of subsistence-caught salmon.
7 When he sells that, can he go back and get
8 his 25 fish back, or once you sell it, it's
9 gone?

10 MS. TRUMBLE: I think whatever
11 you're allowed -- whatever the allowable
12 take is per resident in whatever region,
13 that's your limit.

14 MR. SIMEONOFF: Is that correct?

15 MR. UBERUAGA: I believe so.

16 MR. SQUARTSOFF: According to
17 Kevin Brenner who runs the Kodiak Department
18 of Alaska Department of Fish & Game,
19 subsistence, they keep saying over and over,
20 if you fill that 25 limit, you can come back
21 and get another permit. You can get as many
22 permits as you want.

23 MR. UBERUAGA: I believe a lot of
24 areas will do that, will -- under the State
25 regs, they will extend their limits.

26 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Now Federal, I
27 don't know what the difference is.

28 MS. TRUMBLE: Technically, under
29 State regs, it is illegal to sell your
30 subsistence fish.

31 MR. JENNINGS: Correct.

32 MR. SQUARTSOFF: So I guess -- so
33 we're going to be issued different Federal
34 permits, then, for this?

35 MS. TRUMBLE: That's where our
36 area comes in differently. People can put
37 in proposals to take fish under the
38 Federal -- on Federal lands, see? That's
39 where --

1 MR. SQUARTSOFF: You have to
2 apply for a separate permit if you want to
3 take fish to sell, barter?

4 MS. TRUMBLE: It has to go
5 through this council by proposal, the same
6 thing we've been doing with all these other
7 proposals. You can limit -- if it came
8 through, you can limit it depending on the
9 area and what the people are asking.

10 MR. GUNDERSON: There's only a
11 couple or just a handful of any production
12 streams on Federal lands down in this area.

13 MS. TRUMBLE: We'd be afraid --
14 my concern would be ending up with nothing
15 in those systems, because if it can be
16 abused -- you have your checks and balances,
17 but you have a way to balance it, I mean, to
18 watch it.

19 MR. SQUARTSOFF: I think that's
20 what Al was getting at, if everybody in
21 Kodiak -- because Kodiak is rural, they all
22 know they can sell for a \$1000 for fish.

23 MS. TRUMBLE: You limit. As a
24 council, you wouldn't want to pass something
25 like that because of the potential impact,
26 see?

27 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Uh-huh. Who
28 gets permits and who doesn't, but they're
29 all rural people.

30 MS. TRUMBLE: I've asked Jim, I
31 think, when I was going through this process
32 to send me what the totals were over a
33 number of years, and I wish I would have
34 brought those with me, and I didn't, from
35 the Aleutians and Kodiak area on what the
36 permitting and the recording is on how many
37 permits were given out for subsistence fish
38 in our areas, and what -- you know, the
39 report that came back on it. I really wish
40 I would have brought that with me. But I
41 think we can get those reports out to you.
42 Because it kind of gives you an idea of
43 what's being done for subsistence in our

1 areas by the State guidelines.

2 MR. FOSTER: Are you guys still
3 working real close with ADF&G on all this?
4 I see the same problems that I see from the
5 beginning. One section that's Federal, then
6 State, then Federal and State again. How --

7 MS. TRUMBLE: We had State people
8 at the table. There was State people there.

9 MR. FOSTER: Figured out any way
10 to manage this?

11 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Enforce it.

12 MS. TRUMBLE: I think, basically,
13 they said at this point it gives them some
14 tool to be able to enforce this matter.
15 We're looking at this.

16 MR. CRATTY: I was just going to
17 mention something. Maybe we should go back
18 to our tribes and see if this is something
19 that's needed. If it's not needed, let's
20 not do it.

21 MS. TRUMBLE: This notice has
22 been sent out to all the tribes. Our tribe
23 hasn't gotten to discuss it.

24 MR. SQUARTSOFF: The tribes are
25 still involved -- the tribes are -- I see it
right here, where you can -- it's posted you
can pick up your permits. Kodiak, all the
villages are able to issue permits through
the tribal council offices and return them
back to the tribal offices.

MS. TRUMBLE: What are you
talking about?

MR. SQUARTSOFF: Subsistence
permits. So they are working together.

MS. TRUMBLE: Carl?

MR. JACK: I was going to
mention, the comments, because of the legal
relationship of the Alaska tribes, the

1 comments will be handled -- submitted
2 directly to the Federal Subsistence Board
and not go through any advisory bodies.

3 The tribal officials, they're not
subject to the Federal advisory committee.
4 I think you can deal one on one with the
government and essentially negotiate your
5 position if you wanted, but that's basically
the....

6 MR. TUTIAKOFF: My question is
what are we doing here? We're appointed by
7 the tribes. We're appointed by the tribal
entities of each of the communities to
8 represent their issues on the Federal
issues. If the tribes have taken the
9 position, we superceded their actions, what
we are doing here.

10
11 MR. JACK: That's the way the
Federal management --

12 MR. TUTIAKOFF: That's what's
going to come up during this whole process.
13 We set up this recognition of the tribes
through this RAC, Regional Advisory
14 Committees. We're not appointed here by the
corporations. We're not appointed here by
15 individuals. We're appointed here by our
village corporations, village councils, all
16 of us are.

17 MS. TRUMBLE: It's in here, if
you look at the schedule, No. 2, it says,
18 "Task force needs to consider comments
received from the regional councils, tribal
19 governments, and general public."

20 So, technically, as a council, I
think, we -- you know --

21 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Don't want to
create any big problems if we're wasting our
22 time here doing what they're going to be
doing anyway. This is an issue --

23
24 MS. TRUMBLE: It's listed, I
think. Technically the other part of this
is a lot of us do sit on our tribal councils
25 and through the course of discussion and the
interaction of everybody else, we're able to

1 bring some of this, you know, back to our
2 communities in our regions. I think the
3 other part of it is -- that's just it. We
4 have that ability to try to come back to our
5 regions.

6 But the -- all of these comments
7 and questions and concerns that are brought
8 up today were brought up at the level of the
9 task force, you know, time and over and over
10 again, and a lot of other issues over and
11 above that. I mean, it was -- I mean -- and
12 it's going to go through -- all the tribal
13 councils are going to go through this
14 process. They're going to want to know and
15 have the same questions and concerns. Some
16 of them are going to want more.

17 We try to kind of create an
18 umbrella that we can look at as a state as a
19 whole and recognize and realize that as
20 regions those totals or those amounts may
21 change.

22 MR. FOSTER: I was just kind of
23 thinking about the poor guy who has
24 subsistence fish and wants to sell a little
25 bit, or he doesn't know if he can, or where
26 he's fishing. We've got all these different
27 areas that are controlled by these different
28 groups. It's going to be kind of hard on
29 subsistence to decide exactly what he can
30 do.

31 MS. TRUMBLE: Also enforcement.

32 MR. CRATTY: Live by the ocean.
33 It won't be hard for the guys living in the
34 Interior. It's plain and simple for them.
35 People who live near the ocean, it's going
36 to be harder.

37 MR. TUTIAKOFF: The point is, do
38 we agree with \$1,000 or no money at all?

39 MR. SIMEONOFF: Madam Chair?
40 I'd like -- I am opposed to
41 selling our subsistence way of life, but on
42 the other hand, I mentioned this to some of
43 the people at my village, and they said that
44 whether they do it or don't do it, there are
45 some people that are going to do it anyway.

1

MR. CRATTY: Yeah, that's --

2

MR. SIMEONOFF: They've had a bad fishing season or they didn't make any money this summer, and they fall back on their subsistence foods and they can take that into a bigger town and sell it. Whether we do or don't, I think some of the people are going to just go ahead and keep on doing it.

6

MR. TUTIAKOFF: Do we want to see them arrested?

7

I don't think so.

8

MR. SQUARTSOFF: No.

9

MR. TUTIAKOFF: That's what they're going to end up doing here if we don't provide them an avenue, then we'll leave it up to the Troopers, the brown shirts to come out there and put handcuffs on people and take them out of communities. If we don't have this guideline or something in place, that's what's going to happen. They'll take it upon themselves to determine, and they'll go to jail.

15

MS. TRUMBLE: It also opens the door for some abuse in a sense in both ways.

16

Technically, it's happened both ways, as far as enforcement from all that I've heard.

17

MR. ZACHAROF: Just an example, on St. Paul, we don't have any salmon out there. We get a bunch of salmon from folks in the Aleutians, or Interior. They send it by the bagfuls, and we sell it out there.

20

MR. SQUARTSOFF: You wanted me to give you some. And you want to sell it.
(Laughter.)

22

MR. TUTIAKOFF: Processed fish.

23

MR. SQUARTSOFF: I don't know -- I also feel like Mitch, I think subsistence is subsistence or traditional use, I'd rather call it than subsistence, but I really don't want to see no monetary value

25

1 put on salmon. Maybe some areas need it.
I'm speaking for where I live anyway.

2

MS. TRUMBLE: Why don't -- I
3 recommend at this point is go around the
table, maybe, and give each one of the
4 council members a chance to voice what your
view is on this. Somehow we're going to
5 have to take a --

6 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Take a vote.
Roll call vote.

7

MR. CRATTY: I'd like to ask Carl
8 one more question.

Carl, what will happen now if the
9 tribes -- most of us sit with our tribes,
but if they agree that they want to do it
10 and we disagree that we don't want to do it?
What's the conflict going to -- what's it
11 going to boil down to?

12 MR. JACK: I think in terms of
the process, the comments by the regional
13 council, the public, and the tribes, once
they get to the Federal Board, they will
14 have equal weight as to how to make the
comments, and the Federal Board is the one
15 that will make a cut on this.

So, it's -- that's, I think, all
16 I can say is that the comments from the
tribes, the regional councils, one is not
17 going to supersede the other. You will have
equal buoyancy when they're considered by
18 the Federal Board.

19 MR. LUKIN: I'm wondering why
there was a deadline put on that when you
20 got a statewide problem there that needs to
be addressed by all the communities of the
21 state? Why was it set in October? And who
set that?

22

MR. JACK: We did. Those of
23 us --

24 MS. TRUMBLE: Technical, the
council chairs, and the staff.

25

MR. LUKIN: It seems like this is

1 being pushed through and forced through,
2 where if it's such a big important issue
3 there should be given more time to the
4 people of the state to come up with some
5 kind of decision that should be made to
6 satisfy everybody.

7 MS. TRUMBLE: I think too, Ivan,
8 it was brought -- it may not come to a
9 decision. It's going through a process that
10 we may not actually get through. The public
11 part of it is part of that process.
12 I don't know, I just --

13 MR. SQUARTSOFF: I got -- some of
14 these documents, I got in April and May from
15 their meetings.

16 MS. TRUMBLE: I guess when you
17 look at -- using as an example is the roe
18 that was sold. If -- the roe that was sold,
19 if you take the amount of money, and the
20 people that was given to sell that roe, the
21 abuse was given in a sense in that regard.
22 When you're looking at a whole fish and
23 selling a whole fish within a region, there
24 are technically no limits. You can't take
25 that roe out of that region and have them
26 sell it for more than technically \$1000. My
27 feeling to some degree is it helps put some
28 guidelines, I think, around maybe some of
29 the things that were happening in the past
30 that may have contributed to these river
31 systems not having the fish that they don't
32 have now.

33 MR. LUKIN: It goes right back to
34 what he said awhile ago, at least what I'm
35 hearing is that if you're taking -- if
36 you're fishing out there commercially for 15
37 cents a pound in pinks, the only way you can
38 make it is on a million pounds or whatever
39 and you hope to hell you don't have a major
40 breakdown or something that's going to
41 collapse your system for the summer. You're
42 killing the resource by overfishing it
43 versus -- I'm not sticking up for sale of
44 smoked salmon or any other fish or
45 subsistence fish. But I'm just looking at,
46 you know, we're talking protecting this

1 resource here, and here you're talking a
2 handful of fish versus millions and millions
3 of pounds of fish during the summer by
4 commercially caught fish.

5 MS. TRUMBLE: I think we need to
6 try to remember that a small -- like a
7 portion of this, a small portion of it is
8 subsistence fish.

9 Another portion of it is the
10 commercial fish.

11 Another portion of that is your
12 sports fish.

13 Somehow, all of these things are
14 going to have to come together so we have a
15 resource, a sustainable resource.

16 MR. SQUARTSOFF: That's my
17 biggest concern, resource, what's going to
18 happen with the resource?

19 MR. GUNDERSON: That's what I'm
20 afraid of; if we commercialize subsistence,
21 everybody that could figure out a way to do
22 it, will be doing it.

23 MS. TRUMBLE: My comment -- one
24 meeting, well, they were talking about a
25 limit of \$15,000 is our guys can't get fish,
26 they can't fish, then we're just going to be
27 subsistence fishermen. That's a statement.
28 But on the other hand, we are going to get
29 these fish. We don't have, technically,
30 access to it.

31 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Except in the
32 rivers.

33 MS. TRUMBLE: We don't have
34 rivers.

35 And those limits come back to the
36 sport. There's a lot of, you know --
37 there's been a lot of thought and
38 discussion. The same discussion that we're
39 having now.

40 MR. JACK: I have just have one
41 more comment about method and means. I've
42 noticed that, for example, in Kuskokwim,
43 there's no permits issued. People just go

1 out and do it.

2 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Traditionally.

3 MR. JACK: Traditionally, and
4 that is allowed by the in-season manager.
5 For example, even though they were dealing
6 with stocks of concern last summer, they
7 were allowed to fish for subsistence four
8 days per week. There is no individualized
9 permitting system so far in place in some
10 parts of Alaska. There is in other parts of
11 Alaska.

12 MS. TRUMBLE: Would it be
13 recommended to add a section in this to,
14 basically, recognize the need for a
15 permitting system?

16 MR. SIMEONOFF: Maybe we can put
17 a low cap on the financial -- on
18 subsistence-caught foods. Leave it real
19 low, \$500. If you put a high number on it,
20 family members will put a thousand bucks.

21 MS. TRUMBLE: These people are
22 paying \$5, \$6 a gallon for fuel up there.
23 That's just --

24 MR. SIMEONOFF: That makes it a
25 commercial enterprise if you got to buy gas
for your boat to go get it and bring it back
and sell it.

MS. TRUMBLE: Technically, in a
sense it was more -- in some areas, it was
just a way for them to be able to continue
to hunt other things just because they're
able to buy gas by selling, you know --
there's a lot to this.

21 MR. ZACHAROF: Other thing, the
22 economics up in the Yukon area, the
23 economics is very tough up there in that
24 region; and, selling \$1,000 of fish is a lot
of money to those folks. It helps the
system pay for gas.

25 MR. SQUARTSOFF: That's what I
was saying. I don't want to vote against

1 the people up in Yukon and Kuskokwim. I
2 think they need it up there. But do we need
it here?

3 MS. TRUMBLE: And if you look at
4 this process, too, you can accept this as a
5 general, but as a council, you can come back
and change it and say zero.

6 MR. JENNINGS: Madam Chair, maybe
7 you ought to add something maybe for
8 clarification. I think there is some
9 latitude, the \$1,000 was a starting point
10 for discussions at each of the council
11 meetings. As I understand what the task
12 force indicated was that each region could
13 decide if that \$1,000 was appropriate or not
14 on a regional basis, so there could be
15 recommendations from all ten regional
16 councils that will come in that would be
17 different. It could be that the proposed
18 regulations will set dollar limits on a
19 regional basis and it won't be just \$1,000
20 on a statewide basis.

21 So there is, I believe, that
22 latitude that you're seeking, Pete, just to
23 address Kodiak/ Aleutians and in the
24 regulations.

25 MS. TRUMBLE: I know what Pete's
26 concern is in our area. If we open up a
27 system for a permit process, to allow fish,
28 this council can come back and say, "You can
29 only take one fish. You're not going to get
30 no \$1000 on one fish." You have some --
31 there are some ways to address this, too.

32 Ivan?

33 We were kind of going around the
34 table, maybe, trying to get everybody's
35 view.

36 MR. SQUARTSOFF: I guess the only
37 other thing, the State -- the State people,
38 are they going to be able to enforce on
39 Federal like they do at the Buskin?
40 Robert?

41 MR. STOVALL: Within our region
42 you're saying?

1 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Or is U.S. Fish
2 and Wildlife going to hire more enforcement
people?

3 MR. STOVALL: I don't foresee
4 that happening. The best Fish and Wildlife
5 Service would be able to do would be able to
6 hire seasonal people, that would be -- that
7 would be the closest, an increased amount of
law enforcement people would happen. We'd
be working with the State in conjunction
with this. Anytime we're out there, we're
usually working in conjunction with the
State.

8 MR. UBERUAGA: With that example,
9 I'd like to mention that there are real
10 problems with some of the State and Federal
11 regulations in conflict in that area, in the
Buskin, in terms of 24-hour fishing period
12 versus 6:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m. There are
inherent conflicts in those regulations.
13 So, there's a lot of things to work through
that are going to need to be addressed in
14 the future. That's all I can say. It's
very complicated. Law enforcement
15 currently -- I look at it as a very, very
difficult situation in that the State is
issuing a permit for you, a Federal user.
You want to go out and fish under Federal
16 regulations. The State has issued you a
permit. It may allow you to fish under
17 State regulations. There's really lots of
conflict there, and it's just....

18 MR. SQUARTSOFF: John was saying,
19 there's State/Federal on the Yukon Kuskokwim
River.

20 MR. TUTIAKOFF: To get this thing
21 off center, I'm going to make a motion.

22 MS. TRUMBLE: Go ahead.

23 MR. TUTIAKOFF: We adopt the
24 regional council tribal governments' draft
regulatory language for Title 50B, Title
36B.

25 MS. TRUMBLE: Do I hear a second?

1 Any second?
2 I think we will ask for a roll
3 call vote on this.

4 MR. GUNDERSON: I second it.

5 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Guess we're on
6 discussion.

7 MS. TRUMBLE: Did somebody ask
8 what the motion was?

9 MR. JENNINGS: Restate the
10 motion, please.

11 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Adopt what's
12 presented, this draft form or whatever. I
13 just gave it Title 50B, Title 36B of ANILCA.

14 But I'm with Pete and Speridon
15 that there shouldn't be any value to a
16 subsistence fish. But I'm -- when I was
17 growing up, I had to do some of that, to
18 actually exist, to survive during the
19 winter. Go do maybe 4 or 500 dried fish or
20 4 or 500 smoked salmon, and as Richard
21 mentioned, we sent it to St. Paul, maybe for
22 trading. But in some cases we actually sold
23 it to, say, the AC store that was in
24 existence at the time in Alaska, and they
25 sold it to boats, the Penguin, the mail
26 boats going from here to King Cove, Yakutat,
27 and carried with them and sell it. A month
28 or two or three months later, when they
29 returned, we'd have money. It was middle of
30 the winter and that would be to keep us
31 going, pay the electric, buy the oil, buy
32 groceries. So I understand what they're
33 talking about here, but we did it without
34 having regulations in place, and I guess the
35 hard facts are, like I said this morning, if
36 we have to create a ruling on subsistence
37 and we're getting down to a point of
38 actually determining whether we can be a
39 subsistence user based on our own having to
40 put in a law, then it's getting pretty bad.
41 But I understand the needs from the other
42 regions. I mean, they're in worse shape
43 than we are today, than maybe we were 30
44 years ago as smaller communities where we
45 had no economic development in communities

1 that we have today.

2 So, I'm having a hard time, you
3 know, saying that it should be \$1,000, \$500
4 maybe for our region. I'm having -- even
5 \$1000 is excessive for what I'm considering.
6 If we can get to some kind of agreement with
7 all the regions so we don't have our people
8 taken out of the villages by a state trooper
9 or some nonresident who observes this
10 happening and maybe they be on a charter or
11 something, and he goes back to Kodiak,
12 reports this to a trooper. That guy's over
13 on the next plane arresting people because
14 we haven't done our duty in allowing some
15 kind of criteria to be put in place.

16 MS. TRUMBLE: I think we need to
17 remember, as long as it's rural to rural,
18 within rural, there's no limits.

19 MR. TUTIAKOFF: I understand
20 that. We're talking about the biggest
21 problem in all this is the money. It's not
22 the trading and going rural to rural. It's
23 the money. It's putting a value on
24 subsistence that, we, as the users,
25 subsistence users, never really looked at
it, like, "I'm going to go out and go
fishing and have a \$500 bill in my pocket."

MR. CRATTY: It's always been
trade or barter.

MR. TUTIAKOFF: This has gone to
other regions.

MS. TRUMBLE: Pete, John, and
then Speridon.

MR. FOSTER: I don't know which
way to go on this. I don't want to see the
subsistence fish sold, but I also don't want
to deny the opportunity for somebody to sell
some of their fish. I don't want to make
some poor guy break the law just because he
wants to sell some of his smoked salmon to
buy a little fuel or buy some Christmas
presents. I don't know which way to go.
I'm stuck right in the middle of this.

1 MS. TRUMBLE: Speridon?

2 MR. SIMEONOFF: One question that
3 comes to me is if we do this, is there a way
4 back? Can we go back to subsistence not
being -- can we take that value back once we
do it?

5 MS. TRUMBLE: Is that a question?
6 We'd do a recommendation --

7 MR. SIMEONOFF: Can we put a
monetary value on the way of life, sometime
down the road, everybody is well-to-do, we
want to say, "No, you can't sell subsistence
anymore"? Can we do that?

9 MR. TUTIAKOFF: I think that's a
10 question maybe --

11 MS. TRUMBLE: Richard or --

12 MR. UBERUAGA: Restate that
again. I was talking to Carl.

13 MR. SIMEONOFF: If we put a
14 monetary value on our subsistence way of
life and then down the road, down the road a
15 few years everybody is well off and wanting
to use subsistence sales as a monetary gain,
16 can we take that monetary value back? Can
we -- as an advisory council or the Federal
17 council, can we say you can no longer sell
subsistence? Can we come back after
18 everybody is well off?

19 MR. UBERUAGA: I would defer to
Carl or Tim -- Tim is also a member of the
20 task force.

21 MR. JENNINGS: Thanks.

22 MR. UBERUAGA: I was just a
notekeeper. It's a tough question. It's a
23 tough question. I'd like Carl to address
it.

24 MS. TRUMBLE: Carl is going to
25 push it over to Sandi?

1 MR. JACK: Let me just preface my
statement by saying that -- I'm talking
2 about Alaska Natives, not rural residents,
for the most part, that's what Title VIII --
3 because of Alaska Natives, it was not
because of nonNative subsistence. So, from
4 that perspective, well, you look at the
political status of Alaska Natives and look
5 at, like, what Canada is. Canada
government, they recognize subsistence as an
6 economy that should be protected, and they
have done that where it's different from
7 here in Alaska, in a way, but it's kind of
protected through rural preference.

8 So, having said that, my sense is
this -- this regulation is for the benefit
9 of the enforcement officers to be able to
enforce what they perceive to be violations.

10 So, I think what will happen,
though, here, is once the regulation's in
11 place, it's going to be very hard to take it
back, because it's a tool of enforcement
12 officers.

 Now, if there's a provision
13 whereby the option is open for the regional
councils to reconsider that and have that
14 acted on by the Federal Board, through that
process, I think it can be taken back.

15 But it's -- you have to go
through the rule-making process because it's
16 a rule -- it's a rule-making process subject
to the administrative procedures act again.
17 It's going to be very hard to take it back.

18 MR. JENNINGS: Madam chairman,
I'll take a shot at this, maybe from a
19 little bit of a different viewpoint or angle
than Carl has mentioned. I agree with what
20 Carl's saying. When it's finalized it would
be a regulation, and I think one perspective
21 or one way to view this is, as Vince has
mentioned, it recognizes a traditional use
22 and practice in the region. And the
council, through your recommendation, could
23 be saying, in our region, "This is what we
believe is an appropriate level of cash
24 sales which we believe is a customary
practice in terms of customary trade in the
25 region."

 In terms of your question, I

1 think, in the future, you might come back
2 and perhaps say that customary practice has
3 changed, but I believe at that point it
4 could be done, but you'd want to demonstrate
5 and have some justification about how the
6 change has occurred and why the
7 recommendation we have now before us and
8 what could be in regulations has changed
9 enough to change the regulations.

10 But regulations can be changed.
11 I think it will be -- as you all know, this
12 has been a difficult process to the point we
13 are now, and we haven't changed the
14 regulations yet. If we get to the finish
15 line where it's expected that the Board will
16 take a final action next May, there's no
17 guarantee that they will, but that's their
18 expectations that they will make some sort
19 of recommendation and take a final action in
20 May that it's a long process.

21 To go through that again is going
22 to take a lot of effort by everybody. So, I
23 think it's a fairly high threshold to then
24 go back later and change it.

25 MS. TRUMBLE: Maybe -- I think we
have a discussion -- we have a motion for
Vince -- did you --

MR. TUTIAKOFF: Maybe, I think
what's bothering everybody, and it might
address Speridon's issue, is there a
possibility that this regulatory draft
language can only be in effect for a
two-year period and reviewed at that time by
direction of this wording, by some wording
on there, to be addressed at that time?
That would give us time to see if this is
going to work. If it's not working, don't
keep it, throw it out and go back to redoing
it over. But I see what the concern is
maybe from some of us here. We've set it in
stone, and you know dog-gone well once you
get it in the Federal Register, it's going
to take you 10, 12 years to get it undone.
If you set a timetable, especially this
section that addresses cash sales of
subsistence between rural residents and
others, you should add the wording in there
that says this section shall be in force for

1 A two-year period only and shall be
2 reviewed at that time by the regional
3 council and the Federal Board. I mean, that
4 gives us some time to see if this thing is
5 going to work. And maybe this could
6 bring -- that kind of wording could be a
7 resolve to this monetary value issue. At
8 least until we can determine and work on a
9 better language later.

10 That's just a suggestion.

11 MR. JENNINGS: Madam Chair, that
12 is possible. It's called a sunset clause.
13 After two years, it would expire.

14 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Expires, and if
15 it's not renewed by another figure or kept
16 the same by a vote of the Federal Board, it
17 goes away.

18 MR. JENNINGS: It expires. That
19 can be done in regulations.

20 MS. TRUMBLE: I know we have a
21 motion on the floor. I would like, at this
22 point, if we can, to not directly vote on
23 this, but to take about a ten-minute break
24 and then come back, if that's okay. I kind
25 of want to go off the record here a little
bit and talk about a couple of things, just
amongst ourselves.

1 MR. SQUARTSOFF: We could amend
2 it, make a motion to amend -- we need to
3 word it somehow.

4 (Short break.)

5 MS. TRUMBLE: Are we ready to get
6 started here?

7 You may want to yell out in the
8 hall.

9 We did have a motion made by
10 Vince and seconded by Paul.

11 MR. TUTIAKOFF: I'd like to make
12 an amendment to the motion.

13 MS. TRUMBLE: Okay.

1 MR. TUTIAKOFF: I'll read the
2 amendment. This refers to action A-12 of
3 Title 50B, Title 36B. These regulations
4 under A-12 will expire in two years from the
5 effective date of the regulations unless
6 extended, superseded, modified or revoked.
7 And that will only affect Title A-12. It
8 will not affect A-111 -- A-11 or A-13. Just
9 that one section.

10 Second.

11 MS. TRUMBLE: Question called --
12 or the amendment.

13 Discussion?

14 We had a call for question, all
15 in favor, signify by saying "aye."

16 COUNCIL MEMBERS: Aye.

17 MS. TRUMBLE: Opposed, same.
18 Go back to the motion.

19 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Motion is that I
20 move to adopt sections Title 56B, Title
21 50B -- 50B, and 36B.

22 MR. GUNDERSON: Second.

23 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Roll call.

24 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Ivan?

25 MR. LUKIN: I Think I'm going to
abstain.

MR. SQUARTSOFF: Speridon?

MR. SIMEONOFF: Yes.

MR. SQUARTSOFF: Richard?

MR. ZACHAROF: Yes.

MR. SQUARTSOFF: Paul -- John,
I'm sorry?

MR. FOSTER: Yes.

MR. SQUARTSOFF: Paul?

1 MR. GUNDERSON: Yes.

2 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Della?

3 MS. TRUMBLE: Yes.

4 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Vincent?

5 MR. CRATTY: Yes.

6 MR. SQUARTSOFF: And I also vote,
7 yes.

8 MR. CRATTY: Yes.

9 MR. SQUARTSOFF: And I also vote
10 "yes.
 We have eight "yes" and one
11 abstain.

12 MS. TRUMBLE: Okay.

13 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Good job.
 Moving on, as soon as I find my
14 agenda here. Before we move on.
 Also, if we can add under
15 additions or other new business, item No. C,
16 moose for 9D. I think we wanted to discuss
17 possibly taking action and then we will
18 submit a proposal.

19 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Moose for 9D.

20 MS. TRUMBLE: It's council
21 consensus to add it.
 Thank you.
22 Regional council charter.

23 MS. CHIVERS: Thank you, Madam
24 Chair. If I can refer all of you to Tab K
25 in your booklet.
 There's a copy of your charter
26 there. When Congress passed back in 1972
27 the Federal Advisory Committee Act, they
28 formed the regional advisory councils.
 Regional advisory councils here
29 in Alaska -- which were created to advise
30 the Federal government on subsistence.
31 Because backing the term limits
32 of advisory committees to two years, the

1 secretaries must renew the charters by
December of even-numbered years.

2 At the fall meetings, they ask
3 that we review our existing charter and make
4 recommendations for changes if we want to
5 make change also to the charter. The items
6 that you can change in the charter are the
7 name change, boundary change, the size of
8 the council membership, and criteria for
9 removing a member.

10 So that's what we're looking for
11 at this time to see if the council would
12 like to make any changes to our existing
13 charter.

14 If we decide to make the
15 recommendation, the recommendation will be
16 reviewed by the Federal Subsistence Board
17 and the staff committee, and we'll forward
18 the recommendation on to the secretary,
19 which will take approximately six months
20 before the charter is -- this would happen
21 about six months before the charters would
22 expire.

23 Then the Secretary of the
24 Interior with concurrence of the Secretary
25 of Agriculture, then approves and signs the
charters for the next two years.

We're looking to see if the
council wants to make any changes to the
existing charter.

MR. TUTIAKOFF: Move to adopt the
charter, no changes.

MR. CRATTY: I second.

MS. TRUMBLE: Motion by Vincent,
seconded by Al Cratty accept as it is.

Discussion?
Call for question?

MR. ZACHAROF: Question?

MS. TRUMBLE: All in favor,
signify by saying "aye."

COUNCIL MEMBERS: Aye.

MS. TRUMBLE: Opposed, same sign.
Motion carries.

1 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Motion for
2 compensation: Can we have that brought in
3 so we can change it the next time?

4 MS. TRUMBLE: That one actually
5 comes up a lot, Vincent, from a lot of
6 regions. We can add it to our agenda. Last
7 item again. It doesn't hurt to keep trying.

8 MR. JENNINGS: Madam Chair, Tim
9 Jennings from the office of subsistence
10 management. I will give you a briefing on
11 how the jurisdiction -- this is for
12 informational purposes only, and it does not
13 require any action by the council. If you
14 will turn under Tab L, that's the first page
15 of your materials under Tab L.

16 During the current round of
17 fishery proposals, the Federal Subsistence
18 Board receives three proposals related to
19 halibut for consideration. And at this time,
20 there was a decision made to withdraw or
21 defer those proposals from consideration
22 pending clarification of Federal subsistence
23 management jurisdiction and implementation
24 procedures. As I think many of you know,
25 the management of halibut is governed by the
International Halibut Treaty and the
Northern Pacific Halibut Act with
jurisdiction within the United States
resting with the Secretary of Commerce.
Title VIII of ANILCA does not supersede or
modify the North -- Northern Pacific Halibut
Act.

At this time, there are legal
uncertainties regarding whether the Federal
Subsistence Board can actually implement
subsistence regulations, and if they can,
whether these regulations would have to go
before the International Pacific Halibut
Commission for their approval.

Upon resolution of these
uncertainties, proposals dealing with
halibut will then be reexamined for
appropriate processing and potential Board
action. We don't know when this resolution
will occur, but we are working on this issue
through our legal staff in consultation with
attorneys from the Department of Commerce.

1 On a different track, not
2 directly related to the Federal subsistence
3 program, regulations are currently being
4 developed by the National Pacific Fisheries
5 Management Council for Secretary of Commerce
6 approval dealing with halibut. We've
7 included these in the draft proposed
8 regulations in your materials as
9 information.

10 And we would note that these
11 regulations as currently drafted would be
12 more expansive than the Federal Subsistence
13 Board could adopt because they would make
14 the provision for subsistence take of
15 halibut by Alaska tribal members -- by
16 Alaska Tribal members living in nonrural
17 areas, and you'll see a summary of the major
18 provisions of the draft national -- or
19 Northern Pacific Fisheries Management
20 Council regulations as provided there.

21 I won't go into or read those
22 specifically. If you have any questions, we
23 could discuss those.

24 And a final note is that the
25 North Pacific Fisheries Management Council
anticipates publication of a proposed rule
dealing with subsistence halibut in late
2001 with a final rule and implementation in
the spring of 2002. So that's the time
frames that they are currently targeting for
the draft regulations under the Fisheries
Management Council.

Madam Chair, that concludes my
briefing.

MS. TRUMBLE: Questions for Tim.

Pete, I'm just wondering where
they came up with this daily bag limit of no
more than 20 halibut.

MR. JENNINGS: I'm not familiar
with the basis of how they came up with
their proposed regulations. I would defer
to anybody else here in the audience if they
may know that, if there is anybody here.

MR. FOSTER: I think the argument
on that was they -- instead of -- like if
somebody wanted to go out and get
subsistence halibut, instead of going out

1 and getting one or two a day, it would be a
2 whole lot easier for them to go out and get
the halibut every day.

3 MR. SQUARTSOFF: You can go out
4 every day and get 20 halibut fast.

5 MR. FOSTER: There was a lot of
discussion about that.

6 MR. JENNINGS: That was in Sitka.

7 MR. SQUARTSOFF: What are they
8 getting, one-pound halibut?

9 MR. JENNINGS: They also put a
\$400 maximum cap on commercial trade of
10 halibut. I don't know where they came up
with that amount. There was a lot of
discussion. Robin Samuelson --

11 MR. FOSTER: Every area put in
12 their recommendation. It was everywhere
from zero to way up there.

13 MR. ZACHAROF: \$400, 400 bucks
14 they came up with the dollar --

15 MR. JENNINGS: The dollar amount
is in your book there. That's what's
16 proposed in the regulations.

17 MS. TRUMBLE: \$400 annually.

18 MR. CRATTY: Per family member.

19 MR. SQUARTSOFF: I'm more
20 concerned about salmon than halibut.

21 MS. TRUMBLE: Any other questions
for Tim?

22 MR. JENNINGS: I guess it's not
in your book is it?

23 That part of it looked like it
got dropped. There are a couple of
24 provisions there that didn't get into the
book. No subsistence-taken halibut could be
25 retained on a vessel at the same time as
commercial halibut are being retained. No

1 subsistence-taken halibut could enter the
commercial market and the customary trade of
2 halibut would be limited to an annual
maximum of \$400.

3 So, we will update you perhaps at
the next meeting when we have some
4 resolution as to what the Federal Board and
the Federal subsistence programs'
5 jurisdiction is in regards to halibut.

6 MR. GUNDERSON: Is this going to
come up sometime this winter during one of
7 the National Marine Council meetings or --

8 MR. JENNINGS: I understand it
would come up in December. Is there a
9 meeting scheduled in December, John, do you
know?

10 MR. ZACHAROF: Yes, there is,
11 North Pacific meeting in January.

12 MR. JENNINGS: No, in January?

13 MR. ZACHAROF: Yes.
Okay.

14 MS. TRUMBLE: Thank you, Tim.
15 The next report is by Carl Jack
on partnerships and fisheries resource
16 monitoring.

Carl, I think, has a class, and
17 he wanted to take this one and one other
issue up after, if we go into -- after
18 dinner, maybe. He's got a class. until
6:30, or tomorrow morning if we come back
19 tomorrow morning.

20 MR. CRATTY: Tomorrow we'll skip
to the -- from Dan LaPlant.

21 MR. LAPLANT: My name is Dan
22 LaPlant. I'm the wildlife liaison to the
Board of Game in the office of subsistence
23 management. In your council book.,
specifically on Tab L, the third page there,
24 page 3, there is a briefing entitled
"Federal/State coordination," intended to
25 update you on the status of the working
relationships between the Federal and State

1 agencies relative to the Federal subsistence
management.

2 During February and March last
winter, 2001, at the regional council
3 meetings, Alaska Department of Fish & Game
found it necessary to significantly reduce
4 their involvement in the council
deliberations due to the lack of adequate
5 funding to support their staff. In
addition, State resource professionals were
6 unable to continue to participate in the
State and Federal memorandum of agreement
7 working groups that were at that time
working toward developing protocols.

8 Since that time, since your
meetings last fall, excuse me, last winter,
9 we were able to resolve this funding issue.
In May, we signed an agreement that resolved
10 this issue at least for the balance of the
calendar year.

11 In addition, we agreed that
additional funding for liaison and staff
12 support for overall coordination and
cooperation is a high priority for the
13 Federal subsistence program, and we do
anticipate to have additional funding
14 available to the Alaska Department of Fish &
Game for such support in the year 2002 and
15 beyond. Hopefully, we're over that issue.

16 We are, again, fully engaged in
coordination. Recent discussions with the
Federal Subsistence Board chairman, Mitch
17 Demientieff, and Frank Rue, reaffirmed
continued support for full coordination,
18 cooperation between the Federal and State
programs. We have Alaska Department of Fish
19 & Game representatives here at this meeting,
and they plan to be in attendance at all the
20 other regional council meetings this fall.

21 In addition, the MOA working
group met at the end of August to address
you to get the protocols back on track so,
22 this coming winter, at your meetings that
are scheduled for February and March, we
23 hope to provide you with a calendar at that
time of how we plan on getting those
24 protocols back on track, what the schedule
will be.

25 Madam Chair, that concludes my
presentation.

1

MS. TRUMBLE: Questions?

2

Thank you, Dan.

3

Next item on our agenda is a report on YK resolution, extraterritorial jurisdiction.

4

I asked this to be put on the agenda because I think many of you are aware of what happened here, I believe, in May and I know most of the council members I talked to directly in regard to this issue, I've talked to a lot of the tribal councils, the cities, in both our region and Kodiak. I've also helped draft some letters for some of the tribal councils to get out in regard to this issue.

9

And I think it got resolved in a manner that I think -- it did get resolved, and, basically, I had -- you know, the concern was for another region to be taking action, technically when they didn't have the authority to do it, No. 1. But to be asking the Federal Board to -- and the Secretary of Interior and even including the Commissioner to exert an extraterritorial jurisdiction all the way from the north side through area M, through the Shumagins, through the Chigniks, all the way through Shellikoff Straits, and I was really concerned about the manner and the way it was handled.

16

I had just come home from a statewide Federal board meeting and sat between three of these -- the council chair that also had signed this resolution for three days. And not once at any one time was I given word that this resolution had been signed off in March and that letters and a copy of this resolution had been sent out.

21

In fact, I got wind of the resolution by some other Federal entity that asked if I'd seen it.

22

And I really felt it was unfortunate that this had happened in the manner it happened, and the concern -- because it's a concern that this council had brought forward many times to the various regions and to the Federal Board to try to coordinate the efforts in regard to concerns

25

1 in other regions.

2 We did have our teleconference
3 with the Chair from that region, and Paul
4 did sit in with me through the course of
5 that teleconference, and basically said that
6 we didn't -- you know, it was terrible -- it
7 was a bad thing to do too, I think, our
8 region, all of our regions, all the affected
9 regions, period.

10 And I think you also in your
11 booklet have a letter in regard to that from
12 Mitch which basically states that council
13 chairs when you're wanting to take action or
14 discuss other regions or anything that
15 affects other regions, that the council
16 chair or appointed member from the council
17 will attend their meetings.

18 But if anybody had any questions
19 or comments or anything in regard to that
20 whole issue, I felt that it should be on our
21 agenda since it technically was a pretty
22 major issue and action taken upon us.

23 MR. TUTIAKOFF: I Don't have that
24 in here. Do you have it in here?

25 MR. JENNINGS: The letter?

MS. CHIVERS: It's the annual
report.

MR. JENNINGS: It's under Tab E,
page 4. Page 4 of Tab E, under the response
to issue No. 2.

MS. TRUMBLE: And also after
this, I've been getting the weekly updates
from the various councils in the YK region,
and I will be attending their gathering to
assess and go over what, basically, went on
up there this summer, and I'll be attending
that. I think it's the 9th through 11th of
October.

One of the things -- in reading
all the reports is I strongly feel that the
cooperative entities and all the councils --
the State and the Federal, have put together
a system, I think, that appears to be
working.

I know there was some concerns at

1 some of our C and T meetings that some of
2 these people are getting treated quite badly
3 in their own regions about enforcing some of
4 the regulations that have been put in place,
5 but it appears that the result of
6 enforcement is allowing fish to get up
7 through there in the river systems. It also
8 is allowing the subsistence user to also get
9 their subsistence fish, and it did allow for
10 some small commercial openings on systems.
11 Tim, do you have anything to add
12 to that?

13 MR. JENNINGS: No, Madam Chair.

14 MS. TRUMBLE: Michelle?

15 MS. CHIVERS: No.

16 MS. TRUMBLE: Gentlemen?

17 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Is this the
18 letter, the resolution to close all the
19 waters --

20 MS. TRUMBLE: Commercial fishing
21 for a period of one year.

22 MR. TUTIAKOFF: I Became aware of
23 that -- I got a copy of it from Michelle,
24 maybe, or somebody over in the office, but
25 that was a bad thing. I hope you conveyed
to those Chairs because we did have
experiences of that before, but never got to
that level. Never made it past the signing
of the resolutions.

When there are actions taken by
another regional advisory council that
affects another region, then it's -- it was
understood then, it should be understood now
that they need to at least give the courtesy
of some work sessions, something to come to
an agreement that this is going to happen
before it does happen.

I think you did the right thing.
In writing the response here -- typical
responses we've heard before, but it didn't
actually address the issue, but hopefully we
can curtail some of that. It doesn't need
to be happening.

1 I'm sure we wouldn't take any
2 action and close everything from Bristol Bay
3 and Norton Sound Fisheries. We don't have
4 the authority.

5 MR. GUNDERSON: It was a pretty
6 strong letter that was put out by Tom Boyd,
7 who was talking to the people that were
8 involved, and they also were involved in the
9 teleconference that Della and I had with
10 them last spring, and there was a lot of
11 back-pedaling going on there for a bit.
12 That was going to happen --

13 MR. TUTIAKOFF: The letter was
14 already sent. It never came before the
15 regional chairs. It's something that was
16 passed amongst themselves as an action.

17 MR. GUNDERSON: Uh-huh.

18 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Those regional
19 advisory councils who have chairs that do
20 things like that should have some sort of
21 policy that allows for them being removed
22 from the RACs. That's something that should
23 be brought to the Federal Board. They are
24 responsible for any kind of, in my opinion,
25 side-stepping or whatever by the chairs at
these meetings, because they represent their
regions.

1 MS. TRUMBLE: I think -- my
2 understanding, they -- all the RAC's hadn't
3 passed those resolutions. It was signed by
4 three of the councils. It was real
5 unfortunate. I did get phone calls
6 afterwards from a couple of chairs
7 apologizing. When you look about our
8 regions and area M, the cutbacks that we had
9 received, and the minimal windows that we
10 had for opening, for something to come down
11 for you so hard and extreme, in an area so
12 unbelievably large that it's really
13 unfortunate, and in my opinion, it was a
14 lesson well learned, and I hope that in the
15 future that they will follow through in what
16 they have said, that we will make an
17 effort -- they will make an effort to work
18 together on this.

1 MS. CHIVERS: From Tom Boyd, the
2 coordinators have been directed that anytime
3 there's regional overlap of issues regarding
4 issues, we have to keep each other informed,
5 so we can get it from the chairs, and keep
6 everybody informed, anytime there's an
7 overlap.

8 MR. SQUARTSOFF: I just feel it
9 was handled very quickly. Della informed me
10 right away, kept right on me, just passed it
11 on to the city, and tribal and Cody City and
12 Kodiak Borough. Everybody was informed. It
13 was over very quickly.

14 MS. TRUMBLE: I appreciate the
15 efforts of all the council members that
16 helped me through this. It took me by
17 surprise. Squared the -- it scared the heck
18 out of me. I was madder -- yeah, I was mad.

19 MR. GUNDERSON: You called on the
20 phone that day.

21 MS. TRUMBLE: Anyway, we'll move
22 on.

23 U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
24 endangered species update. Do we want to
25 try to see if he is available? Michelle,
26 you mentioned he was called earlier. He
27 wasn't there.

28 When we get to Izembek National
29 Wildlife Refuge, we're all getting on a
30 plane and flying to Cold Bay.

31 (Laughter.)

32 MS. TRUMBLE: Thank you, Greg.
33 We're on the agenda in regard to the
34 endangered species update, and I know the
35 council had requested if you could be
36 available or someone could be available at
37 this meeting. In talking to you last week,
38 you mentioned that you were pretty busy but
39 could be available by teleconference.

40 I think we're looking at a couple
41 eider, and what may be coming up here with
42 the sea otters. I guess if you could give
43 us some information at this time, then we'll

1 turn it over for council member questions.

2 MR. BALOGH: Okay. General
information, the stellar eider is the only
3 of the two eiders that you folks need
concern yourselves with down there listed in
4 '97, critical habitat was finalized in, I
think it was February of this year. We
5 maintained before -- or during the critical
habitat listing process, we maintained that
6 it would have no regulatory implications,
and we continued to conduct our
7 consultations in that manner so that
critical habitat really shouldn't matter as
8 far as the impact on any projects down
there.

9 We undergo the Section 7
consultation process on spectacle eiders
10 with and without critical habitat. We're
doing it the same way now that we did before
11 critical habitat.

And the sea otters, I am most
12 knowledgeable about, but I know that the
Aleutian population is now a candidate
13 species and will undergo the listing process
when we get money to do so, and I understand
14 that it's not likely to show up in fiscal
year 2002'S budget.

15 So it's not an impending listing
action, the way I understand it. I think
16 that can change if we get sued by an
environmental group. They may be able to
17 enforce us to -- not to list it, but to put
it in the listing process before then, which
18 may or may not result in it ending up being
listed.

19 Is that the kind of stuff you all
were looking for?

20 MR. GUNDERSON: Yep.

21 MS. TRUMBLE: Any questions?

22 MR. SQUARTSOFF: I got one on --
23 Pete Squartsoff from Port Lions.

24 MR. BALOGH: Say it again, your
name.

25 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Pete Squartsoff

1 from Port Lions on sea duck mortality from
2 crab lights on boats going through passes.
3 Has there been anything done on that? Any
4 research?

5 MR. BALOGH: There is, of course,
6 fishery observers out on these boats. When
7 we train fishery observers at the North
8 Pacific Observer Training Center, we always
9 instruct them to report incidences of bird
10 strikes and storms to us. We don't get a
11 lot of -- well, data is not tabulated in
12 anything. That's easily quarried.
13 Basically, we get a stack of Xerox sheets
14 that we then have to flip through looking
15 for reports of that, and there is -- there
16 are a couple instances where stellar eiders
17 have struck vessels and there's other
18 instances of other birds striking vessels.
19 It's not been something that we've been able
20 to summarize in a nice, neat report and it's
21 not anything that the observer program has
22 done for us.

23 As far as doing research, it's a
24 tough thing to research because it's a rare
25 occurrence. We know that it occurs. We
don't know to what extent.

MR. SQUARTSOFF: I don't feel
it's very rare in the wintertime when the
birds are migrating through these passes.

MR. BALOGH: Give me the names of
some of the passes that we would be --

MR. SQUARTSOFF: Where I live is
Whale Passage by Kodiak. It's not stellar
eider, it's king eider, old squaw -- what's
them little black ones? Sea quail.

MR. BALOGH: Little black ones
would probably be -- there's guilnots or
scoters --

MR. SQUARTSOFF: Some scoters,
the biggest impact we've seen in our area is
the king eider.

MR. BALOGH: Gosh, Peter, I
wonder if I could get your phone number to
talk to you about this later.

1 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Sure.
2 907-454-2333.

3 MR. BALOGH: 454-2333.
4 I didn't get your last name,
5 Peter.

6 MR. SQUARTSOFF: S-q-u-a-r-t-s-o-
7 f-f.

8 MR. BALOGH: Thanks, Peter.

9 MS. TRUMBLE: Any questions?

10 MR. FOSTER: Does he have any
11 kind of update on the sea lions or
12 something?

13 MS. TRUMBLE: The question, Greg,
14 is if you had any update on sea lions this
15 summer. I think you kind of gave me where
16 you're at with that the other day.

17 MR. BALOGH: Sea lions is a NMFS
18 issue. I had absolutely nothing to do with
19 them. All I know about sea lions is what I
20 read in the newspaper and what I hear at
21 fisheries meetings just like you all.

22 MR. FOSTER: I was just wondering
23 if they were surveying or looking around
24 this summer. There was some pretty dramatic
25 changes in the water around here this year
again. There was an incredible amount of
whales here and that had to do with the
amount of feed that was in the water this
year, just a huge amount of oily fish feed,
candlefish or whatever, and then there was a
lot of small black cod and herring and I
think the other one is mackerel, just huge
amounts of feed in the water this year, and
the whales were feeding on it, the sea lions
were feeding on it, and there was a lot more
small sea lions this year that I saw, packs
of 20 and 30 of them.

MR. BALOGH: I know NMFS is
throwing a lot of money in sea lions right
now. I don't know what they're doing with
it or what they found.

1 MS. TRUMBLE: Anyone else?
2 Greg, there doesn't appear to be
3 anything else. Thank you.

4 MR. BALOGH: It's a good thing I
5 didn't come out there for three days, huh?

6 MS. TRUMBLE: We would have
7 figured out something else.

8 MR. BALOGH: Call if you think of
9 any other questions, okay?

10 MS. TRUMBLE: All right. Thanks.

11 MR. BALOGH: You bet, bye.

12 MS. TRUMBLE: Izembek National
13 Wildlife Refuge. I think there's a report
14 from Rick Poetter.

15 MS. CHIVERS: There is a report
16 in the book. And Rick Poetter did apologize
17 for not being able to make it to the
18 meeting.

19 MS. TRUMBLE: One of the things
20 that I look at in here, it may be something
21 else that we want to add to -- when we do
22 the moose is on his -- on page 6, he's got
23 state resident season currently goes five
24 days longer in September than present
25 Federal subsistence season which closes
September 5th -- this might be a
consideration for the RAC to consider. I
think we probably should consider that.
Caribou.

MR. TUTIAKOFF: This is on the
caribou.

MR. FOSTER: One other thing I've
seen in here. He's talking about the
decline in the swans nesting and stuff. One
thing I've seen this year is there's a lot
more swans down in this area this year.
I've seen quite a few nests on these
islands, there are a lot more swans.

1 MS. TRUMBLE: I've noticed them
flying over. I never hardly see swans by
2 air, and I could see them.

The other thing. I think, in
3 his, is the -- I kind of disagree with this
brown bear population. I've never seen so
4 much bear in my life, tremendous amount of
cubs this year.

5 MR. FOSTER: Yeah.

6 MS. TRUMBLE: Two to three cubs
7 with just about every bear. I've never seen
so many cubs, ever; and I've been told, I
8 think by Warren with -- that flies with
Kenai float planes that in one area along
9 the river system, it must be in this area
somewhere, he counted 100 bears in a small
10 area. So, I totally kind of disagree with
these bear counts. I wish he was here to be
11 able to talk about some of this.

I know he did get reports of a
12 lot more bears on Unimak. He says he
disagrees with their counts, but people on
13 False Pass disagree with his counts or
estimates anyway.

14 He's asking 60,000 be needed in
potential donors and 10,000 are potentially
15 needed for studies, conducting a new
technique to count.

16 Is that something we can put a
proposal in when we're going into these
17 different fundings for next year as a study?

18 MR. JENNINGS: Madam Chair, the
funding process that we've gone through is
19 through the fisheries information service
for fish.

20 On the wildlife side there is
moneys that are programmed transfers to the
21 refuges. And as I understand the process,
not being involved with it firsthand, but as
22 I understand it, the refuges will put
together a list of studies and resource
23 needs they believe are critical to help them
manage and address subsistence issues in the
24 refuges, and those come up to the regional
office level of the service in Anchorage,
25 and then there's discussions that go on
between the assistant regional director for

1 refuges, and Tom Boyd, the assistant
regional director for subsistence.

2 So, in that process, the council
could submit at least a letter recommending
3 or noting this is a priority for
consideration for needed subsistence
4 management regulatory change or issues in
your area.

5 But there is no formal process
like there is on the fisheries side for
6 wildlife.

7 MS. TRUMBLE: I know in Unit 10,
I heard rumors of up to 600 bears. He said
8 250.

 Let's see. The other -- of
9 course, the other item that was in his
report is the moose, and, like I said
10 earlier, we do have it on our agenda, but I
do have concerns that the permitting system
11 that went from 10 last year and they were
being able to be drawn by people within our
12 region, and if you look at that number, it
got increased for the State permit drawing
13 for up to 20, increased to 20 by Alaska
Board of Game. 18 people applied and all of
14 them are selected and Anchorage has five of
those. King Cove, three; Nelson Lagoon,
15 three; Eagle River, one; Juneau, one;
Wasilla, one; and Willow, one. I think
16 we'll address this a little bit later by
putting together a proposal before we
17 convene.

 Any other comments or questions
18 in regard to Rick's report?

19 MR. SQUARTSOFF: I was just
wondering on these guides, how many guides
20 they're going to allow, the very last --

21 MS. TRUMBLE: The list of guides?

22 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Guide fish
permits and waterfowl permits.

23 MS. TRUMBLE: I think -- were we
24 able to address the amount of guides that
are within our refuge system through the
25 plans?

1 MR. JENNINGS: Madam Chair, is
that directed to me?

2 What was the question again?

3 MS. TRUMBLE: Pete was wondering
how many guides are -- that are listed here.

4 There probably can be more, but can we
address the amount of guiding or -- that's
5 going on within a refuge system by the
CCF --

6

MR. JENNINGS: CCP?

7 I think Robert would know the CCP
planning process better than I could, but I
8 understand you can address that through the
CCP; is that correct?

9

MR. STOVALL: Yeah, it relates
10 back to compatibility, and what would be
allowed -- what uses would be allowed on
11 particular areas of the refuge that you're
talking about. It is analyzed during the
12 CCP process. And alternatives can be
developed which would address different
13 levels of that activity based on
compatibility that was determined.

14 I don't know what items are being
presented to state or what their CCP
15 revision is. I know Kodiak is -- we're
about two thirds of the way through it,
16 and --

17 MS. TRUMBLE: I did get copies of
both. Did all of you get copies of them?

18

19 MR. STOVALL: You did get a copy
of the Kodiak, the last one?

20 MS. TRUMBLE: Thank you.

21 MR. JENNINGS: Madam Chair, on
the caribou issue, we staffed, we staff --

22 Dave Fisher confirmed that the state season
is five days longer in both Unit 9D and Unit
23 10.

24 MS. TRUMBLE: So, we should do
that for both of them before we leave.

25 Okay. Kodiak Island National
Wildlife Refuge, Robert.

1 MR. STOVALL: Thank you, Madam
2 Chair, members of the Regional Advisory
3 Council. My name is Robert Stovall. I'm
4 with the Kodiak National Wildlife Refuge,
5 subsistence biologist.

6 I'll try to be brief. I did give
7 a copy of the report to all the council
8 members and there's extra copies on the
9 table, and I'll just basically hit some of
10 the highlights of this report. Basically --

11 Basically, each report that I've
12 written so far, I kind of outlined the
13 inventories and the surveys that we've been
14 doing. I look at some of the public use and
15 subsistence use activities that are going
16 on, and anything in general that I think
17 needs to be mentioned.

18 For information purposes, the
19 intensive area surveys for Kodiak Brown bear
20 were down in the Ayakulik Peninsula this
21 year. The numbers were lower than they were
22 when it was done about four, five years ago.

23 Larry VanDaele with the State
24 would have a full report on that, and I'm
25 going to defer -- actually, telling you that
information -- providing you that
information, because, quite frankly, I don't
have it and I don't understand the reason --
what his numbers came up with.

1 I did participate in the survey,
and we did do the counts there.

2 Bear stream surveys were, again,
done this year, and in addition to that, we
did a survey -- survey study of bear use on
the Red River and Pinnell Creek area, using
stationary camps to do counts and observe
bear use patterns in those two systems.

3 Going to waterfowl, our conduct
surveys continue to be done on the east side
of the Kodiak Refuge and also on the west
side.

4 One thing that I want to bring --
mention to the regional advisory council,
5 the harlequin ducks that were banded in
'96-'97 since 2000 that we've had as many
band returns on a population of 211 ducks
that were harvested, which indicates that
there's a possibility of an overharvest
occurring there and because of that, we also

1 looked at -- we actually did a count of the
2 birds in the area that were done -- that was
3 done in '96 and '97 and done just recently,
4 and there appears to be a decline of up to
5 as much as 50 percent in the Uyak Bay area
6 on the Kodiak Refuge, and a letter -- a
7 letter is going to be written to the
8 migratory bird office stating this
9 information, to see whether there should be
10 any type of regulational change for the Uyak
11 Bay area for harlequin ducks.

12 This letter, once it does get
13 produced, I'll make sure that a copy gets
14 sent to the regional advisory council
15 members, and they'll know exactly what's
16 going on.

17 The next opportunity to do
18 banding eagles and refuge-wide surveys will
19 be next year. Once again, this year they
20 did stratified random plot surveys.

21 The denominators are a little bit
22 lower for both nesting effort and success,
23 and we think it's based primarily on the
24 fact that the deer population mortality
25 surveys -- mortalities were a lot lower, and
the eagles have a tendency to use the
carrion as a free food source and if the
carrion is not there, they seem to produce
less birds and less nesting activity.

But we're going to do an
island-wide survey next year. The numbers
are still very high, so there's not a
concern at this moment.

Little River -- Little River Lake
we put a weir in to check a video monitoring
program we're trying to do with sockeye
runs. The video -- the weir was put in to
count and -- count and check what the video
was observing. And we're planning on doing
that again next year in some other areas in
the Olga Bay River systems area.

Something I don't have in here
that I wanted to make mention, we have in
cooperation with the State sport fish and
codfish run in Kodiak and have been
monitoring the Buskin River use of and
effort for the Buskin River sockeye run,
subsistence run. That's part of our
in-season subsistence management.

This is going to be an ongoing

1 program to monitor not only the Buskin, but
2 we're going to probably try to increase the
3 effort and look at the Letnik, Afognak
4 Island area as funding and personnel allows
5 us.

6 This is an effort we're really
7 looking at to see how many -- how many boats
8 are out -- how many skiffs are out fishing,
9 how many nets are in the water. We're
10 trying to get an idea how many fish they're
11 getting so we can have an in-season
12 monitoring of the particular effort that's
13 going on on the Buskin for subsistence
14 fisheries. It was primarily since the end
15 of June that we did this monitoring.

16 The report -- I would like to
17 have the report to you folks for -- of this
18 in-season fisheries management activity for
19 the next meeting.

20 We did do mountain goats aerial
21 compensation -- composition efforts. I did
22 it myself. We covered three area on the
23 refuges; the Three Saints Bay area; the
24 Hepburn Peninsula area; and the Grayback
25 Mountain area, which is north of Horse
26 Marine, east of Ulga Bay and counted over
27 240 goats in those three areas with the most
28 being on the Grayback Mountain area of 100
29 animals.

30 The State also did goat surveys
31 in the areas that they've normally been
32 doing in a few other expanded areas on the
33 refuge. The goat population is estimated to
34 be around 1300 animals, which is 300 animals
35 above the threshold that the State would
36 like to have them at.

37 We -- I did do an aerial sea
38 otter survey this year similar to and in the
39 same areas that we did in 1994. The results
40 from that survey indicate that the
41 population estimate -- the population
42 decreased by approximately 40 percent. In
43 your package that I gave you, there is
44 newspaper articles that describe that
45 information. They're in the back of your
46 packets.

47 The last thing I wanted to do,
48 touch base about was -- is the biological
49 review that the refuge went through. This
50 review was all-encompassing. It involved

1 research biologists and fish biologists in
2 the wildlife and fisheries, and out of state
3 and ADF&G personnel were all involved in the
4 effort to review what surveys we are doing;
5 why we should be doing them; how we've been
6 doing them; how we can improve them. A
7 report will be produced by a regional office
8 as to recommendations that will have come
9 out of this biological review.

10 So, if the regional council has
11 any research that they would like to see
12 from a wildlife standpoint, please let us
13 know and we can go through the process of
14 including that in the biological review
15 analysis.

16 Sport fish guide permits were
17 awarded to applicants through a prospectus
18 process this year for the following river
19 systems, Ayakulik, Uganik Lake and Lower
20 Uganik River, Little River and Frazer Lake,
21 Dog Salmon River systems. Day permits for
22 other sport fish guides was allowed on other
23 refuge river systems. They just needed to
24 contact the office and they could get a
25 special use permit for day activities on
rivers that aren't part of the sport fish
guide prospectus process.

This is the first year of it, a
little rough around the edges; but I think
for the most part once the guides get used
to working with it, it will work out pretty
well.

We did have a refuge information
technician hired this year. Unfortunately
she wasn't able to come to this meeting, but
she worked from late June through early
September. She got a lot of things done.
She was able to get to all the villages in
Kodiak, and talk with them about refuge
items and, in particular, about customary
and traditional use of mountain goat.

She was able to get to the three
villages that weren't originally included in
the analysis or weren't part of the
analysis, Karluk, Akhiok and Ouzinkie. I
included her report from those village
meetings in the handout that you folks have
received.

In general, just to paraphrase
what she found, essentially the residents

1 were reluctant to speak out in the villages
2 about activities of goat use that may have
3 occurred outside of permitted activities.

4 And based on the -- based on
5 that, they were fearful of being in trouble
6 with not following regulations.

7 We were not able to get a
8 definitive answer as to customary and
9 traditional use of mountain goat as
10 occurring in Akhiok, Karluk, or Ouzinkie.
11 Karluk and Larsen Bay did agree that there
12 is mountain goat use and that there should
13 be a C and T determination made, and they
14 suggested how that can go about being done
15 and that's included in the report here.

16 I think the last thing I wanted
17 to mention is that the refuge celebrated its
18 60th birthday this year with a big open
19 house and salmon barbecue that everyone was
20 invited to attend, and over 300 people from
21 the Kodiak area did attend the barbecue and
22 listened to a short speech by Senator Ted
23 Stevens.

24 That's all I had.

25 MR. CRATTY: I want to know, this
26 woman not being able to make it to Old
27 Harbor, ain't going to have no effect on the
28 C and T, on the goat issue. No, that's the
29 only village she didn't make it to. It
30 won't have any bearing, because you're
31 already part of the analysis. And with the
32 meeting that was held earlier this year, of
33 course, public input for C and T
34 determination in Old Harbor was given for
35 Old Harbor residents during that meeting.

36 It wasn't a bad thing that she wasn't able
37 to go to Old Harbor, but it would have been
38 nice to have gotten all the villages in.

39 Kolena, unfortunately, had to
40 leave our employment; so we are going to
41 advertise the position, it's a local hire
42 position. It's going to be a permanent
43 full-time with an intermittent work
44 schedule. They'll work when we have the
45 work available, not work when we don't. I
46 encourage anybody from Kodiak, any of the
47 regional advisory council members who know
48 anybody that would like the position to give
49 me a call. I would like to hire somebody

1 from the villages to do that.

2 MR. CRATTY: I wanted to ask a
3 question on the harlequin ducks on the bay,
4 has that declined because of the duck
5 hunters, the outfitters on the -- I know
6 they get a lot of duck hunters in there.

7 MR. STOVALL: Yes, they do. It
8 seems like in times when there is lean deer
9 hunting that duck hunting becomes more
10 active. That's happened in the last couple
11 of years. There's been an increase of duck
12 hunting the last two hunting seasons.

13 Definitely, no, I can't tell
14 you whether that's -- we have not done any
15 research one way or the other, but the band
16 returns are sort of a marked capture system
17 when you have that percentage of animals
18 being returned from hunting. That's just
19 the ones that are being returned from
20 hunting in a population that's not that
21 large. You can expect that a lot more ducks
22 have been harvested from the population,
23 based on those band returns. So, there is
24 concern about that; and, like I said, that's
25 why we want to take a look at whether or not
there should be any regulatory changes
occurring for next year.

That's why I wanted to mention it
to you so that you're the first ones to know
about it.

MR. CRATTY: My concern is it's
going to affect the rest of the islands, if
they're getting a lot of hunters in there.
You know they ain't taking the birds for
subsistence use or anything. They're taking
them for sport hunt to stuff them. That's
what my concern is. It's going to fall back
on the people in Old Harbor and Akhiok who
probably eat them.

MR. STOVALL: I'm not sure how
the subsistence -- because those regulations
are basically still being put into place. I
don't know how that's going to work from a
subsistence standpoint.

MR. FOSTER: Della.

1

MS. TRUMBLE: Okay, John.

2

MR. FOSTER: On the sea otter decline, how do you stop the decline of sea otters when it looks like it's due to natural predation by killer whales and sharks, lower -- without going directly to lowering the killer whale population?

How do you stop the decline from natural predation?

7

MR. STOVALL: I don't know if you do stop the decline. If there's a decline and the predators eat all they can, then they'll go away. Then the population rebuilds again. That's the natural way of the way it happens.

10

Just suffice it to say that sea otter hunting, subsistence sea otter hunting is not the reason for these declines, that's a definite. And I see no regulations that would come into effect to change that.

Sea otter subsistence hunting will continue based on what I know from the ability for sea otter hunters to get them. That won't change.

15

MR. FOSTER: Basically you're saying, "Let mother nature take care of it."

16

MR. STOVALL: Yeah. And it's not exactly -- they're not exact -- we're not exactly sure whether it's just killer whales and sharks that's doing it. It might be other factors. The Kodiak population may have a different set of reasons than the Aleutian Island Chain reasons. I don't think it's killer whale/shark population in Kodiak, and I say possibly, as I say possibly, No one knows for sure, putting facts together and see if it makes sense, whether the killer whales are doing it in the Aleutian islands. There's been a decline in the peninsula, northern portion also. It's a widespread decline. There's probably many reasons for the decline, but none of which have been identified.

25

MS. TRUMBLE: I have a couple of

1 questions for Robert. The first one was at
2 our meeting in Old Harbor, toward the end of
3 the meeting, Al Cratty and Pete Squartsoff
4 made a request for a goose study, the motion
5 passed unanimously. Was anybody following
6 up on that?

7 MR. STOVALL: I haven't put
8 together a goose study. I'm pretty sure
9 Denny hasn't. What we would like to do is
10 gather some goose samples from Old Harbor
11 for a genetic check of the population to see
12 if it's a population that is new or a
13 population that was from a plant that was --
14 that happened back in the 1980s. Can
15 somebody then get a permit to go harvest
16 them geese so you can get the samples or
17 what? I'll volunteer.
18 (Laughter.)

19 MR. GUNDERSON: Take Robert with
20 you.

21 MR. SQUARTSOFF: How can you get
22 samples if it's illegal to harvest them?

23 MR. STOVALL: Well, I would say
24 an anonymous donor would be one way.
25 Send it on an airplane to Kodiak
refuge.

MR. CRATTY: Send a letter to my
little brother.
(Laugh material.)

MR. SQUARTSOFF: Is there
anything that can be done on that? I think
the people around there are concerned that
the ex-mayor there for 20-some years, he's
the one that brought this up about the
number of them, the increase.

MR. STOVALL: Yeah, what I can do
is I can talk to Bill and to Denny and see
if they had any plans to put together a
study plan of that nature to monitor.

MR. SQUARTSOFF: Hunt down at Old
Harbor instead of going down to North
Dakota.

1 MR. STOVALL: I will talk to Bill
2 and Denny and find out what they plan on
3 doing.

4 MR. SQUARTSOFF: On the other
5 plan that I had, under E on your report,
6 sport fish guide permits were awarded to
7 applicants through a prospectus process.
8 What does that prospectus process mean?

9 MR. STOVALL: It's a process for
10 determining which operation -- sport fish
11 guide operation would be best for the area
12 that they are applying for. They put
13 together an application of how they're going
14 to run their sport fish business and then we
15 look at what they've submitted and we make a
16 selection based on that from the criteria
17 that we have developed for making a
18 selection.

19 MR. SQUARTSOFF: I was just
20 wondering -- I had a permit for years. I
21 didn't get it renewed, somebody else got it.

22 MR. STOVALL: That's because it
23 went through this process for these
24 particular river systems that also I
25 mentioned. It's a five-year permit. After
26 five years they have to go through the
27 process again.

28 MR. SQUARTSOFF: I asked -- I
29 just so happened to ask the new gal that
30 was working out there. She said they
31 attended all the meetings, is what she told
32 me. I think she was very new. I didn't say
33 anything more. I just walked away.

34 MR. STOVALL: I know who you're
35 talking about. That's not the way the
36 process went.

37 MR. SQUARTSOFF: I didn't think
38 so. I knew she was new. You weren't there,
39 so....

40 MR. CRATTY: Robert, I just got a
41 question for you. On the sport fish

1 licenses on Ayakulik, does that include the
2 lagoon or just the river?

3 MR. STOVALL: The lagoon is down
4 off the refuge. Ikhiok River Lagoon is off
5 the river. There's a one-mile parcel there.
6 Ayakulik Native Corporation actually owns
7 that land. Then there's other parcels below
8 that. Above that is refuge.

9 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Getting back to
10 this other thing on the geese down in Old
11 Harbor. If somebody was to -- do you need a
12 specific park? I know the guy -- hunter on
13 the king eider, he said, "All I have to do
14 is cut the tip of the tongue off a king
15 eider."

16 MR. STOVALL: Right now, any part
17 that we get would be better than no parts.
18 Feathers --

19 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Probably the
20 breast?

21 (Laughter.)

22 MR. STOVALL: Feathers, any skin,
23 organs, anything that you would be willing
24 to send to us, we would be willing to get
25 and try to get it analyzed.

26 MR. SQUARTSOFF: It's not going
27 to go if nobody does nothing or know what to
28 do.

29 MR. STOVALL: Right. We could --
30 we could probably -- well, that would be
31 something that I'd want Denny to talk about,
32 not myself. He would know exactly what
33 samples.

34 MR. SQUARTSOFF: I think it needs
35 to come out. There's a guy that moved from
36 Port Lions to Old Harbor, he said where he
37 hunted ducks, there is no ducks because of
38 the geese moving in.

39 MR. STOVALL: That's interesting,
40 because the numbers of geese fluctuate.

1 It's kind of hard to think that the ducks
are being moved out of the area.

2 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Quite a number
3 of them now, I guess.

4 MR. STOVALL: Once again, that
number goes up and down through the seasons
5 and --

6 MR. SQUARTSOFF: We follow
them --

7 MR. STOVALL: Those populations
8 are not being observed.

9 MR. SQUARTSOFF: These are by
local people.

10 MR. CRATTY: Mallards.

11 MR. STOVALL: Mallards? I
12 haven't heard -- I hadn't heard of that.

13 MS. TRUMBLE: It was in the
public testimony in the meeting in Old
14 Harbor, Swen Hawkinson.

15 MR. STOVALL: He said --

16 MS. TRUMBLE: Basically,
testified the goose problem in Old Harbor, a
17 flock of 150 birds, the geese are chasing
the ducks away and replacing the food hoping
18 we can open a season on that, that's where
the request for a motion came in to do a
19 study.

20 MR. STOVALL: Okay. I'll take
that information back to Leslie, our new
21 refuge manager, and see what she says about
that.

22 Ivan?

23 MR. LUKIN: Looking back at page
2. Again, you took that count on the gulls
24 in a couple of areas, yet there was
something you said, over 240 animals. You
25 didn't give us anywhere close to what it
was, one or two -- over 240 animals or a

1 hundred or what?

2 MR. STOVALL: I think the exact
3 count -- I don't know what the exact number
4 was. It wasn't -- it wasn't much over 240
5 animals.

6 MR. LUKIN: The other question
7 is, on the C and T survey, now, I think the
8 people -- in Akhiok and some of the other
9 areas that didn't want to speak up, are they
10 going to continue to have to fear
11 prosecution if they do say something?

12 MR. STOVALL: Pat will probably
13 discuss this a little bit, but what we'd
14 like to try to do, we weren't able to do it
15 this year, is to do an actual mountain goat
16 survey, harvest survey, subsistence harvest
17 survey in particular.

18 Because that type of survey is --
19 you have to have office of management and
20 budget approval of your survey questions and
21 that approval process takes over six months.
22 Sometimes, we, quite frankly, didn't have
23 time to do it. And the state doesn't have
24 that problem, so we are in cooperation
25 working with them to see if they can do the
26 survey. If you folks feel that you need to
27 have that information. If you need that
28 information.

29 And they could probably do the
30 survey in a little bit more timely manner
31 than we would be able to do it. And then
32 that survey, of course, would be a
33 confidential survey, based on how they --
34 they don't attach names to households.
35 That's how they've done it in the past. It
36 would allow for free exchange of
37 information.

38 MS. TRUMBLE: Robert?
39 Any other questions, Speridon?

40 MR. SIMEONOFF: I remember one
41 that came to Akhiok. We did tell her that
42 there was some goats that was used. I
43 talked to other people in the village that
44 they said, "I use goat but I ain't going to
45 say anything. I ain't going to tell them."

1 One of the people that said that, he had
2 taken the advice of Fish & Game to shoot a
3 problem bear and once he shot it, they came
4 down and arrested him. That destroyed their
5 confidence right there.

6 One other question I had, you
7 mentioned there was going to be cameras used
8 in the Olga Bay rivers. Is that Dog Salmon
9 or --

10 MR. STOVALL: Upper station, I
11 think was the area, and possibly Akalura
12 area. Those are the pock ones.

13 MS. TRUMBLE: Okay. Anything
14 else?

15 Just one comment. Thanks,
16 Robert. I had a note here to give to Pete
17 that he ought to give you an award for
18 always attending our meetings.
19 (Laugh material.)

20 MR. GUNDERSON: A medal.

21 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Pete's going to
22 get some goose feathers.
23 (Laughter.)

24 MS. TRUMBLE: King Salmon
25 Fisheries, Jim Larson. I think what we'll
do is finish up with the reports today, and
continue on at 9:00 o'clock in the morning.

MR. LARSON: Well, I will be
brief.

I'm Jim Larson with the King
Salmon Fishery Resource office with the U.S.
Fish & Wildlife Service. I appreciate the
opportunity to address the council here.

First thing I wanted to do was
introduce Mike Edwards right here. He's the
new fish biologist with my office. It's
funded through subsistence management for
in-season management for Bristol Bay, Alaska
Peninsula, the Aleutians. He just came on,
so we've been following the various
fisheries. Obviously, no special actions
last year or this year, so it's a fairly
straightforward position. In addition, his
duties will be to help us develop a

1 pre-proposal and develop study plans, and
2 then he's also involved with the resource
3 monitoring, so if we do have some proposals
4 that people would like to propose in those
5 areas, we'll help you develop pre-proposals
6 for that.

7 In that light, I wanted to
8 recognize Paul Gunderson. He helped us
9 develop a pre-proposal last year to extend
10 the Fish & Game weir. Unfortunately Fish &
11 Game wanted that proposal withdrawn because
12 they were concerned that they might lose the
13 weir if we extended the operation of it. It
14 was -- the thing that I really appreciated
15 about that was that the village of Nelson
16 Lagoon stepped forward, offered up money to
17 help get that thing funded. I think we
18 would have stood a very good chance if Fish
19 & Game would have been willing to extend the
20 weirs. I appreciate your efforts there.

21 Sorry it didn't come to fruition.

22 Let's see. Then the other thing
23 I wanted to just mention real briefly, I
24 think you -- Steve Fried put together a
25 fisheries resource monitoring program, study
status reports, and so you should all have
that and I wanted to just briefly discuss
the Mortensens Creek escapement monitoring
project there. That project is still
ongoing, but through September 9th we've
counted over 4,000 sockeye through there and
over 2000 coho salmon. At this point, what
we're finding is a very interesting movement
of these fish, they don't just trickle in,
they just come in in big numbers like the
coho salmon. They came through in one day,
2,000 fish in one day. That's almost the
number up to September 9th. The sockeye
came in similar movements, came in spurts of
500 in a couple of days, one or two days of
over a thousand fish. So we'll continue to
kind of monitor that fishery and make sure
we don't have any impacts on those stocks.
We're well aware of the concerns with the
Thin Point escapement monitoring project and
we'll continue to monitor and assess the
Mortonsen Creek project. That's one of the
reasons I will be continuing on to Cold Bay
and be reviewing that project here the rest
of this week.

1 So, questions?

2 MS. TRUMBLE: Questions?

3 MR. LARSON: See brief.

4 MS. TRUMBLE: Thanks, Jim.

5 MS. TRUMBLE: I guess we'll
6 recess until tomorrow morning at 9:00
o'clock.

7 (Kodiak/Aleutians Federal
8 Subsistence Regional Advisory Council
meeting adjourned at 4:20 p.m.)

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 I, Sandra M. Mierop, Certified
2 Realtime Reporter, do hereby certify that
3 the above and foregoing contains a true and
4 correct transcription of the
5 Kodiak/Aleutians Federal Subsistence
6 Regional Advisory Council meeting reported
7 by me on the 20th day of September, 2001.

5

6

Sandra M. Mierop, CRR, RPR, CSR

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

